

# Concordia

## Theological Monthly

---

Vol. XVIII

FEBRUARY, 1947

No. 2

---

### Henry the Eighth's Divorce and Luther

By WILLIAM DALLMANN

#### I

"Luther gave the green light to divorce." — Rev. John Toomy in the *Jesuit America* of August 14, 1943.

"Luther teaches any man who is tired of his wife may leave her for any reason whatsoever, and, forthwith, the marriage is dissolved and both are free to marry again." — Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick O'Hare, D. D., LL. D., in *Facts About Luther*, p. 333. Pustet, 1916.

It is a rehash of stale stuff. Four hundred years ago, on May 19, 1536, Eustace Chapuys, Kaiser Karl's ambassador to London, wrote Karl's minister Granvelle: "Many think that the Concubine [Anne Boleyn] had become so audacious in vice, because most of the new bishops had persuaded her that she need not go to confession; and that according to the new sect [of Lutherans] it was lawful to seek aid elsewhere, even from her own relations, when her husband was not able to satisfy her." Which even he did not affect to believe. — Froude, *Divorce*, p. 431.

And Chapuys was able to believe almost anything against Lutherans.

Let us look into the matter.

Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, the friend of Columbus, at eighteen was married to Prince Arthur at fifteen on November 14, 1501.

On April 2 the boy was dead.

Return the dowry of 200,000 scudi? Ridiculous! The

greedy old King Henry VII would rather himself marry his daughter-in-law. Mother Isabella, however, protested, so that the old miser instead betrothed her to her brother-in-law, Prince Henry, who was at that time ten years old.

Of course, this was all wrong; of course, the Pope would make it all right — for a price.

Dispense from the law of God in Lev. 20:21? Even the bloody Pope Julius II balked at that. Assured by Cardinal Hadrian it had been done repeatedly by recent Popes, and implored by the dying mother, the Vicar of Christ at last after a year reluctantly gave the permit on Dec. 26, 1503.

At once it was opposed as unlawful by Archbishop Warham and by Bishop John Longland of Lincoln, confessor of Henry. Catherine's young Spanish confessor instilled doubts in her, for which he was removed. Ferdinand quieted his daughter by pointing to King Manuel of Portugal, living happily with the sister of his first wife, sisters of Catherine, by a permit of Pope Alexander VI. The king was hardly kept from marrying his stepmother.

When on January 27, 1505, Henry was fourteen and of age, his father had him sign a protest before Bishop Richard Fox of Winchester:

"That, whereas, being under age, he was married to the princess Catherine, now, on coming of age, he protested against the marriage as illegal, and annulled it."

When the lad became Henry VIII on April 21, 1509, there was more talk about the marriage being unlawful. Erasmus declares it needed great pressure to get Henry to recant his protest. Be that as it will, on June 3 they were married, Henry eighteen and Catherine twenty-six.

In the spring of 1510 there was a miscarriage, then a stillbirth, and then death soon after birth, so on till 1518. The only one that managed to live was the sickly Mary, born February 18, 1516.

As early as August, 1514, Vettor Lipomano in Rome wrote Venice: "It is said the king of England intends to repudiate his wife." And Venetian Ambassador Marino Sanuto wrote the same — "From the Pope he will get what he wishes as France also did with Pope Julius" — Alexander VI was meant.

In 1523 Confessor Longland told the King his living with

Catherine was a mortal sin, and since then he left her bed, as he told Simon Grynaeus in 1530.

Early in 1525 the Kaiser heard faint rumors about his aunt's divorce.

About Easter Archbishop Warham told Wolsey it was unwise to press the very unpopular Amicable Grant "till this great matter of the King's Grace be ended."

In January, 1526, King Francis I offered his beloved sister Margaret to Henry "in case he was going to have his marriage with Catherine annulled."

Jean du Bellay, Bishop of Tarbes, later Cardinal Grammont, in March, 1527, came to arrange the marriage of the little Princess Mary to the widowed Francis or to his second son, the Duke of Orleans; he questioned Pope Julius' dispensation, and so whether Henry's marriage was legal, and so whether Mary was a bastard. Henry and Wolsey asserted this bothered the King's conscience and led him to seek a divorce, rather an annulment.

John Sherren Brewer does not believe the story. Well, if not true, the Defender of the Faith and the representative of the Vicar of Christ are just plain liars.

### A STRANGE SPECTACLE

On May 17 Archbishop Warham of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Cardinal Archbishop Wolsey of York, Primate of England and Apostolic Legate, cited their king before their court "to answer for eighteen years' sinful cohabitation with Catherine," his brother's widow, against God's law in Lev. 20:21.

On June 22 Henry ordered Catherine to separate from him, for divines and lawyers had informed him they had not been truly married but had been living in mortal sin for eighteen years. She replied her marriage to Arthur had never been consummated, therefore the objections to Julius' permit did not apply. Granted, said Wolsey, but the marriage had been "in the face of the Church"; this established the impediment to open wedlock from which the Pope could not dispense.

Catherine was now forty, fat, and wilted and had "certain diseases," and Henry was at the peak of robust virility, and he now took up the matter with the Pope.

Why should he not look for relief? Augustine, Duns Scotus, Durandus, Gerson, Biel, and others held bigamy allowed. Cardinal Cajetan, whom Pope Clement VII rated the "Light of the Church," in his commentaries on Genesis and Paul's Epistles taught polygamy was not forbidden by divine Law. Alfred Henry Huth in *Marriage of Near Kin*, 2d ed., London, 1887, chapter III, gives many instances. So does Lawyer Charles Hastings Collette in *Luther Vindicated*, pp. 19—20. See also Gallighan, *Women Under Polygamy*.

In 1521 Kaiser Karl's Spanish Council pointed out that his ancestor Henry IV of Castile had in 1437 married Dona Blanca. She gave him no children, and the Pope gave a dispensation for bigamy to marry a second wife on condition that if within a fixed time he had no issue by her, he should return to the first. (*Cambridge Mod. Hist.*, II, p. 241.) The Kaiser himself is another interesting specimen. At eight he wrote his first love letter to Mary Tudor, sister of Henry VIII, to whom he presented a jewel with the monogram K and the posy, in Latin: "Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her" (Luke 10:42). Mary "with moost sadde and pryncely countenance . . . spake parfittely and distinctly in the frensche tonge by a longe circumstaunce the wordes of matrimonye for hir partie . . . without any basshing of countenance, stoppe, or interrupcion therein . . . whiche thyng caused dyverse and many . . . not only to mervayle but also in suche wyse to rejoyse that for extreme contente and gladness the terys passed out of theyr ies."

So Karl by proxy married Mary, confirmed in 1513.

The next year he was engaged to the infant daughter of Francis I of France; should she die, he was engaged to her unborn sister; failing such a birth, to Louis XII's daughter Renee. Then he was engaged to another Mary Tudor, daughter of Henry VIII. Thirty-four years later she was married to Karl's son, Philip II.

Karl was engaged some ten times before he married.

Emmanuel of Portugal married Isabel, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella; then her sister Maria, sisters of Catherine and aunts of Karl; then Karl's sister Eleanor. Karl's own wife was the child of the second of these marriages, and all had been entered by permit of the Pope. So he married his first cousin, who was also his sister-in-law. The only one of



his children born in wedlock was Philip II, and so Elliott-Binns styles Karl "a chronic adulterer."

Karl's children had a like amazing maze of marriage; yet all got papal permits.

Another interesting matrimonial muddle is furnished by Charles Brandon, later Duke of Suffolk and brother-in-law of Henry VIII, "who could resist no woman, and no woman could resist him."

He was engaged to Elizabeth Grey, but flirted with Margaret of the Netherlands, daughter of Kaiser Maximilian I, and when Elizabeth became of age, she refused him.

He broke his engagement with Anne Browne; got Pope Clement's dispensation to marry Widow Margaret Mortimer, related in the second and third degree of consanguinity; declared the dispensation null, won his case, and married Anne Brown, with whom he had three children; in 1515 had the Pope annul the marriage; married the beautiful Mary, sister of Henry and widow of Louis XII — Margaret Mortimer still living. On May 12, 1528, Pope Clement in a bull confirmed the divorce and marriage.

With Mary he had three children. Then he married his sixteen-year-old son's betrothed, a girl of fifteen, with whom he had two sons. The wronged son died of grief.

He began by marrying his aunt and ended by marrying his daughter-in-law. He committed bigamy twice and was divorced thrice. He had no trouble getting the permits of the Pope.

King Henry's other sister, Margaret, was married to King James IV of Scotland, who dismissed his mistress, Jane Kennedy, but soon after took her back. On the death of James, Margaret married the Earl of Angus, who lived with another woman, and Margaret was also guilty of "suspicious living," and in August, 1520, the adulterous Henry warned his adulterous sister she endangered her soul and reputation.

In 1521 she was "over tender" with Albany, Henry Stewart, and in 1525 Henry sent her "such a letter as was never written to a noblewoman." On March 11, 1527, Pope Clement VII annulled Margaret's marriage to Angus, and she promptly married Henry Stewart, who had also divorced his wife to marry his queen, for which he got the Pope's permit. The virtuous Henry had the virtuous Wolsey denounce the

"shameless sentence sent from Rome," hope she will turn "to God's word, the vively doctrine of Jesus Christ, the only ground of salvation, 1 Cor. 3, etc.," reminded her of "the divine ordinance of inseparable matrimony first instituted in Paradise," urged her to avoid "the inevitable damnation threatened against advoutrers."

Bothwell murdered Darnley, the husband of Mary, queen of Scots, lived with her openly, divorced his wife, and married the queen — with the Pope's permit.

Her own brother urged the duchess of Richmond, widow of Henry's bastard, to become the mistress of her father-in-law, Henry VIII.

One divine blamed the matrimonial troubles of Jupiter and Saturn on the want of papal dispensations. Another held the prohibition to marry a brother's wife had crept into the Pentateuch by the fault of a copyist. It was commonly believed, by a mistaken application of a pronoun in the works of St. Antoninus, that Pope Martin V, with a view to avoid scandal, had permitted a man to marry his own sister. Some held a man might marry his sister, grandmother, mother, daughter.

The Jesuit Escobar in his *Liber Theologiae Moralis* discussed the Pope's power to permit the marriage between brother and sister. Thirty-two editions appeared in Spain and three in France by 1651. Bishop Scipio de Ricci of Pistoja in his *Memoirs* describes this "infamous traffic."

Edward Armstrong in his *Charles V* asserts: "The Papacy had before now given dispensation for what plain-speaking men might term bigamy and incest." (Vol. I, 338.)

Lord Acton, a member of Gladstone's cabinet and professor of history at Cambridge, rated "the greatest Roman Catholic historical scholar in England for a century past," admits "the Church often used marriage dispensations and divorces as productive sources of revenue and political influence." (*Historical Reviews*.)

Professor O'Brien of Notre Dame admits Peter's bark was floundering perilously. "In regions, religion was almost dead."

The Professor's friend, the English Catholic Hilaire Belloc, in *How the Reformation Happened*, admits: "There were continual grants of such annulments by the court of Rome. . . .

The whole of late medieval history is full of them. . . . The process was facile. . . . The method was gravely abused." In his *Wolsey* he admits: "Such turpitude on the part of the Popes, such an example set by them to the rest of Christendom, was a commonplace of that corrupt time. It was as much a commonplace as simony or the open keeping of mistresses by prelates; it was as much a commonplace as the giving of great sees and abbacies to children. . . . Henry had lived in the thick of such things, the cases of his two sisters were notorious. He did but follow their example. Margaret was the heroine of a double divorce. She obtained one against her second husband; her paramour Stuart obtained one from his legitimate wife in order to marry the princess after openly living with her. His sister Mary had compelled Brandon to marry her, nor could Brandon do so until he had obtained a similar release from his wife. Henry was indeed moving in a family group. But all Europe was full of the thing. . . . We must not think of it as a piece of work unusual; it was in the very air of those days. All the rich world was full of it. That time was full of annulments and counterannulments."

With such a background why should the King not quite naturally expect to get from the Pope quite easily what others had got? Nay, rather, much more so. Had he not with his learned pen so gallantly defended His Holiness when attacked by that devil of a monk Martin Luther? And had not the Holy Father owned the great debt by giving the glorious title of Defender of the Faith? Did not Clement send the coveted Golden Rose to his royal champion? Was he not still devoutly defending the faith by persistently punishing by blazing pyres those pestilent Lutherans, while the Kaiser was lax in doing his sworn duty?

### HINDRANCES

The Vicar of Christ had gambled on the wrong horse, "The Most Christian King," Francis I of France. "The Most Catholic King" of Spain and German Kaiser, Karl V, spoke to his Holy Father in language which was extremely vehement, Sept. 17, 1526. In 1527 his troops sacked Holy Rome with such atrocities and debaucheries as make even our World Wars look almost like Sunday school picnics. A German diaried: "The troops had destroyed and burned down the city; two thirds of the houses were swept away. Doors, windows, and

every bit of woodwork, even to the roof beams, were consumed by fire. Most of the inhabitants, especially all the women, had taken flight." The neighborhood for fifty miles around was a wilderness. Even the sick in the hospitals were not spared. The army of 20,000 in eight months melted to 13,000 from vice and the plague. Pastor admits the Spanish Catholics were worse than the German Lutherans.

The Holy Father was a prisoner in the Castle of San Angelo for eight months and "dependent on a washerwoman for his daily salad." In order to pay the Kaiser the enormous ransom of 400,000 scudi the Vicar of Christ had to sell chalices and crucifixes and have even his tiara melted down by Benvenuto Cellini! In order to make a little pin money, he sold cardinals' hats.

Pope Julius II had declared invalid an election by bribes or promises, and now the indignant sworn protector of the Church before the Cardinals appealed to a Council against Pope Clement VII, a bastard, elected by bribing Cardinal Colonna!

"The Kaiser has destroyed the temporalities of the Church." The Vicar of Christ was under the iron heel of his imperial and imperious jailer. A papal punster pungently punned: "The Pope cannot err," or wander.

The romantic Kaiser Max once dreamed of ending the Papacy and uniting the papal tiara and the imperial crown on his own Hapsburg head; and now his grandson heard suggestions to end the temporal power of the Pope.

Lope de Soria, the Kaiser's minister at Genoa, on May 25, 1527, wrote his master: "The sack of Rome must be regarded as a visitation from God, who permits his servant the Emperor to teach his Vicar on earth and other Christian princes that their wicked purposes shall be defeated, the unjust wars which they have raised shall cease, peace be restored to Christendom, the faith be exalted, and heresy extirpated. . . . Should the Emperor think that the Church of God is not what it ought to be and that the Pope's temporal power emboldens him to promote war among Christian princes, I cannot but remind Your Majesty that it will not be a sin, but a meritorious action, to reform the Church; so that the Pope's authority be confined exclusively to his own spiritual affairs, and temporal affairs be left to Caesar, since by right what is God's belongs

to God and what is Caesar's to Caesar. I have been twenty-eight years in Italy, and I have observed that the Popes have been the sole cause of all the wars and miseries during that time. Your Imperial Majesty, as Supreme Lord on earth, is bound to supply a remedy to that evil."

Froude comments: "De Soria's words might have been dictated by Luther."

Micer Miguel Mai, Karl's agent at Rome, wrote him on May 11, 1529: "It would be for God's service to reduce them to their spiritual powers. . . . I took my most solemn oath that I would have him [a cardinal] beheaded or burnt alive within his own apartment." On June 5: "Luther's revolt was not to be wondered at, and in what the Lutherans said of Rome they were entirely right, except on points of faith." On Aug. 5: "Salviati . . . a great rogue . . . showed me a minute of a letter . . . a more stupid or rascally composition could not have been concocted in hell." On the 28: "The English were bribing right and left and spending money freely."

Chapuy wrote Karl on December 6, 1529, Henry said the ambitious magnificence of the Pope "had been the cause of so many wars, discords, and heresies." Had the Pope's court observed the precepts of the Gospel and attended to the example of the Fathers [several of whom the King mentioned, to Chapuy's surprise], they would have led a different life, and not have scandalized Christendom by their acts and manners. So far Luther had told nothing but the truth; and had Luther limited himself to inveighing against the vices, abuses, and errors of the clergy, instead of attacking the sacraments of the Church, everyone would have gone with him; he would himself have written in his favor and taken pen in hand in his defense. Into the Church in his own dominions he hoped, little by little, to introduce reforms and end the scandal. "Henry maintained that the only power which churchmen had over laymen was absolution from sin." . . . Should not the Pope, in conformity with the opinions [of the universities] so expressed, declare the marriage null and void, he would denounce the Pope as a heretic and marry whom he pleased.

On Dec. 9: "Nearly all the people hated the priests."

As early as 1512 France was about to throw off the papal power. "At Valdolit, the xiiijth of Julie [1525] Edourd Lee,



almosenar," wrote Wolsey "that the Frenche King wolde offere to your Grace the Papalitie of Fraunce vel Patri-Archatum for the Frenchemen wolde no more obay the Church of Rome."

In 1527 Wolsey wrote Henry glancing at the separation of France and England from the Pope. On June 8, 1527, Karl's agent at Rome wrote him about England becoming a patriarchate separate from the Pope. Karl promised to depose Clement and make Wolsey Pope and offered him \$800,000 to keep him from accepting the Western Patriarchate of France and England as planned by Francis.

### LICENSE FOR BIGAMY

In September, 1527, King Henry sent Dr. William Knight with 3,000 crowns to the Vicar of Christ for "a dispensation to contract a fresh marriage, and that too either without a dissolution of his marriage with Catherine — in other words, to commit bigamy — or after a legal divorce." — The Catholic Ludwig Pastor, *History of the Popes*, X, p. 249. Fourth ed. 1938. Cardinal Pisani took the request to the papal prisoner. He promised to send "all the King's requests in as ample a form as desired" — when free.

On Dec. 4 Knight wrote he trusted in a short "to have in his custody as much perfect, sped, and under lead, as His Highness had long desired." He referred to the dispensation.

On Dec. 9 a man with a long false beard, in a blouse, head and face partly hid by a slouched and battered hat, a basket on his arm and an empty sack on his back, passed unchallenged out of the gate of Rome. Who was it? Pope Clement VII, the God on earth, on his way to Orvieto, the ancient Urbs Vetus, and the bishop's palace dilapidated. On Jan. 23, 1528, Roberto Boschetti found him emaciated and in the most sorrowful frame of mind. "They have plundered me of all I possess; even the canopy above my bed is not mine, it is borrowed." He was bedfast with swollen feet; there were suspicions that poison had been given him. Bread was scarce, even drinking water.

On March 14, Secretary Jacopo Salviati wrote Cardinal Campeggi: "Clement is in such dire necessity that, like David, he must, perforce, eat the loaves of showbread" (1 Kings 21:6).

Sanuto says a Venetian reported: "The court here is bankrupt; the bishops go about on foot in tattered cloaks; the



courtiers take flight in despair; there is no improvement in morals; men would sell Christ for a piece of gold."

On Palm Sunday, April 5, the Vicar of Christ said the court needed reform, the sack of Rome was a punishment for their sins.

In such circumstances Knight pressed the King's request.

The Vicar of Christ, Cardinals Cajetan and Campeggi, Cochlaeus, and others believed in the King's good faith. Henry was supported by Gambara, Salviati, Simonetta, Du Bellay, and Gabriel de Grammont, both later cardinals, Stafileo, dean of the Rota, president of the supreme tribunal by which in the last instance the validity of marriage was decided. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese from the first maintained the general justice of Henry's demand and allowed his opinion to be generally known; he became Pope Paul III.

The Holy Father promised before long the King "should have not only that dispensation, but anything else that might lie in his power."

Knight "actually obtained, after some hesitation, the bull desired by Henry. It certainly had been revised in form by the Pope and the Grand Penitentiary Pucci, but in substance was in agreement with Henry's draft. The bull was drawn up on the 17th of December, 1527, and sent off on the 23d. . . . Absolutely valueless." — Pastor, X, 251.

On his way home Knight got fresh instructions, which made him return. At the end of December he laid before the Pope Wolsey's draft of a decretal bull transferring to Wolsey the whole case, and the Vicar was to ratify without condition and recall, to dissolve the marriage and permit another even in the first degree of affinity.

Why this item of affinity? The King wanted to marry Anne Boleyn, sister of Mary, his mistress.

On the last of December, Knight paid Lorenzo Pucci's secretary 2,000 crowns for the bull, and the King thanked the cardinals.

After advising with Pucci and Simonetta, the Vicar of Christ on January 12 told Casale under seal of confession the King was not to ask the Pope; Wolsey, the papal legate, was to dissolve the marriage with Catherine; Henry was to marry whom he pleased and then ask the Pope for confirmation.

This was the shortest and easiest way out. They can do as they please; if only they do not make me responsible.

Stephen Gardiner and Edward Fox on March 23, 1528, began to belabor the poor Vicar of Christ and did so till April 13. If the Pope refused, England would turn Lutheran, and the King would help himself.

Germany was lost; Scandinavia was lost; France was threatening; if England was lost, all was lost. The Holy Father was ground between the upper and the nether millstone. He was the greatest Cunctator; he dragged out the "divorce" for seven long years.

He spoke of "our plenary power as supreme ruler here upon earth and in the power of the dogs." He said he was placed "between the hammer and the anvil"; "weeping, he prayed for death."

Was not Sir Gregory Casale ordered to make presents? Was not Knight there with 10,000 ducats to give away where they would do most good? Were not Stephen Gardiner and Edward Fox ordered to make haste and spare no money, and was it not repeated to spare no money? Was the Pope not offered a guard of 2,000 men? Did not Cardinal Campegi publicly call Henry "The deliverer of the Pope and of the city of Rome?" The poor Pope was "incowarded" to sign a bull on Maundy Thursday.

On May 3 Fox came with it in triumph. Anne was pleased, and Henry turned somersaults and handsprings—"marvelously thankfully and made marvelous demonstrations of joy and gladness."

Why not? The English Catholic Hilaire Belloc writes: "They both felt the marriage with Catherine was as good as dissolved. They saw no obstacle to remarrying."

#### DUPED

The Cardinal's keen canonical eyes saw the bull was valueless and on the 11th sent Fox to Gardiner to get a decretal bull. After much pressure the Pope signed "with many tears."

On June 11 Gardiner reported to his King the Pope had promised to send Cardinal Campegi with the secret decretal bull.

The Pope also wrote Sir Gregory Casale on the solemn word of a Roman pontiff considering the justice of the King's

cause . . . he would never revoke the power granted or interfere with their execution; should he do anything against that promise, the act should be null and void.

Cardinal Campeggi set out for England at the end of July. On August 28 Naples fell to the Kaiser. Seeing which way the cat had jumped, the very versatile Holy Father now with great agility climbed on the victor's bandwagon, returned to Rome, gave the hat and sword to Prince Philibert of Savoy, who had sacked Rome only a short year before, and rushed messages to Campeggi to do nothing to roil the Kaiser and to burn the secret decretal bull.

On the 24th Campeggi read to the King and Wolsey the secret decretal bull, "which confirmed the demands of Henry to their full extent, was guilty of incredible weakness . . . grievous blunder," writes Pastor (p. 261).

Under the sign and seal of the Vicar of Christ the King saw he had never been lawfully married! Campeggi would not let them handle the bull, nor would he let them have a copy!

Wolsey wanted the Pope's permission to show it to the King's counselors. Casale wrote Clement said no. "I would gladly recall what has been done, even to the loss of one of my fingers. . . . The bull will be my ruin. . . . I repent of what I have done. . . . Let them do as they please, provided they do not make me responsible for their injustice."

The Pope's private secretary, Jacopo Salviati, reported: "Would to God the King had without the Pope's authority made a decision, bad or good; then it would have been done without blame of His Holiness." And Sanga, the Pope's confidant, wrote Campeggi: "Would to God the cardinal had allowed the matter to take its course; for if the King had decided for himself, rightly or wrongly, without reference to the Pope, the Pope would have escaped all blame."

The further developments of the affair, and especially Luther's determined stand against any sanction of Henry's divorce, will be dealt with in the next issue of this journal.

Oak Park, Ill.

---

## Euthanasia

By JOHN H. C. FRITZ

The word *euthanasia* (*eu*, well; *thanatos*, death) was formerly used merely to speak of an easy, painless death. It is now being used in the sense of an intentional cutting short of life in the case of disease, or illness, that may be pronounced incurable and is at the same time very painful — mercy killing. There is little literature on this subject. Consulting a number of encyclopedias, I found that some of them do not consider the subject of sufficient importance and interest to be spoken of at all; even one of the recent encyclopedias does not mention it. And those which mention it tell us that religion, law, and medical ethics condemn self-destruction in every form. To 99.9 per cent of the people the word *euthanasia*, and what it stands for, is an unknown term. Why, then, speak of it at all? Because, according to the daily press (for instance, according to the *New York Times* of September 28), fifty-four prominent Protestant clergymen of this country signed a statement which reads as follows: "A proposal has been put forward to legalize voluntary euthanasia, i. e., painless death for persons desiring it, who are suffering from incurable, fatal, and painful disease. A bill has been drafted to give effect to this, and the proposal is receiving encouragement and support from many thinking people. Such a proposal raises important issues on ethical, legal, and medical grounds. As regards the ethical issue, after giving the matter careful consideration, we wish to state that, in our opinion, voluntary euthanasia, under the circumstances above, should not be regarded as contrary to the teachings of Christ or to the principles of Christianity."

### 1

Can euthanasia, mercy killing, even "voluntary euthanasia," that is, painless death, for persons desiring it, be endorsed? We much hesitate even to put this question at all. Every Christian who knows the Commandment which reads: "Thou shalt not kill," and certainly every minister of the Gospel, deserving of that name, knows the answer to that question. Yet the endorsement by fifty-four prominent Protestant clergymen of "voluntary euthanasia," under the circumstances mentioned, had certain implications of which we should

not lose sight. It is most alarming to hear Protestant clergymen say that in their opinion, "after giving the matter careful consideration," "voluntary euthanasia, under the circumstances mentioned," is by them "not to be regarded as contrary to the teachings of Christ or to the principles of Christianity."

To many people it may seem to be specious reasoning that a person afflicted with a so-called incurable disease should, if he so desires, be permitted to use means to bring about for him a painless and a speedy death. The argument briefly runs thus: He must die anyway, perhaps soon at that, and in the meantime is suffering much pain — why not die now? If the principle involved in the argumentation is correct, why should a person, under the circumstances mentioned, not commit suicide — that is, after all, what he is doing — by hanging, taking poison, or in whatever way *he* may choose? And, furthermore, if the principle involved in the argumentation is correct, why should a person that is afflicted with an ailment which is of a lingering nature and renders him useless in this world and a burden to others not be prevailed upon to accept painless voluntary death at once? And, again, why should not a child that is born as an idiot, the cripple who can no longer earn his own living, the incurably insane who fill our asylums, and the aged who are no longer wanted in this world and are burdensome to others, all of whom might be looked upon as useless in this world and a burden to society — why should not all these be painlessly disposed of? If a man is at all permitted to take life, why not justify infanticide, before or after birth, for which specious reasons may also be advanced? And what about the patients in advanced stages of cancer and tuberculosis? All those who during their entire life are a burden to society, and even the aged who are no longer wanted, would have to live in fear that some "benevolent" relative or friend will try to persuade them or will see to it that they make a painless, speedy exit out of this world. Of course, the clergymen who signed that statement would say: "So far we do not desire to go." But have they not given encouragement to others to go to such limits?

And when is a person afflicted with an incurable disease or ailment? Who shall pronounce judgment: the individual, the physician, or the State? Likely the physician. But physicians

have often erred. This they themselves readily admit. To a certain young pastor in his twenties the attending physician said one day: "My dear sir, you are a sensible man. I can tell you that you will not recover from this illness." "Very well," said the young pastor, "I am prepared to die." But the fact is that I preached the funeral sermon for the young pastor, not when he was twenty, but when he had reached the age of eighty. A father was told by the doctor that his young child had no chance of recovery. The father said: "Doctor, I thank you for your opinion." "Not my opinion," said the physician, "but my knowledge." The fact, however, is that the child with the "incurable" disease is now a young lady very much alive. "A certain woman which had an issue of blood twelve years had suffered many things of many physicians and had spent all that she had and was nothing better, but rather grew worse." No doubt in our day such a woman would have been pronounced incurable. But Jesus healed her. (Mark 5:25-34.) And the same Jesus can still do so today, and does so. Hundreds, we should say thousands, of cases could be cited where "incurables" have been cured. Legislators who are called upon to pass a bill authorizing euthanasia ought well to consider all these implications.

## 2

But the endorsement of voluntary euthanasia under certain circumstances by fifty-four Protestant clergymen has even more serious implications. A minister of the Gospel who knows that God is a gracious God in Christ the Savior can bring the peace of God to sin-sick souls; and knowing the purpose of God when He lets His children suffer pain and affliction, such a minister can comfort them. A minister of the Gospel knowing these things will not say to a suffering Christian: "Die, and be gone." That would be no better comfort than was given to suffering Job by his wife, who when Job was in great agony, said to him: "Dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God, and die" (Job 2:9). What a religion! What poor philosophy of life! We are horrified to write about it. It is so distasteful! The Christian conscience revolts against it! And we dread to think of what next the Modernists of our day will endorse! God have mercy upon them and upon the many souls which by them are being misled.



## 3

Let us abide by the Word of God, and we shall never go wrong. God's Commandment is clear. The Lord says: "Thou shalt not kill." Man's life is given him by God. Says Job: "Thine hands have made me and fashioned me together round about; yet Thou dost destroy me. Remember, I beseech Thee, that Thou hast made me as the clay; and wilt Thou bring me into dust again? Hast Thou not poured me out as milk and curdled me like cheese? Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh and hast fenced me with bones and sinews. Thou hast granted me life and favor, and Thy visitation hath preserved my spirit" (Job 10:8-12.) The Psalmist says: "Thou hast possessed my reins; Thou hast covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Marvelous are Thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from Thee when I was made in secret and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in Thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." (Ps. 139:13-16.) In his address to the Athenians Paul said: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17:26). When Job lost his possessions, and even his children were taken from him, he said: "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away" (Job 1:21). And then we read: "In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly" (Job 1:22). What God has given He alone has a right to take again. What right has a man to shorten the time of grace which God has given him? In fact, by taking his own life, as a person does who deliberately cuts it short, man becomes a murderer; "and," says the Lord, "ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (1 John 3:15).

## 4

Nor does the Christian by wrong means seek to escape the sorrows, tribulations, and trials which still come to him in this life. These very things God uses to try, to exercise, to purify, and thus to strengthen the Christian faith. Such sorrows and trials may be of a physical nature, such as sickness

and pain, loss of property, loss of loved ones, etc., or more of a spiritual nature, as doubts and misgivings concerning one's faith, or hatred, opposition, and persecution which one must endure because he is a Christian. Whatever these sorrows and trials may be, a Christian ought not seek to escape them by running away from them, by fleeing out of the world, but he should rather flee to his Savior, who has overcome sin, the world, death, and the devil and by whose power we Christians can courageously face the sorrows and trials of life and come out victoriously from underneath them, making them serve God's own purpose. The Christian has the promise that all things work together for good to them that love God (Rom. 8:28). In the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews we read: "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth" (v. 6). "Thou shalt also consider in thine heart that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord, Thy God, chasteneth thee" (Deut. 8:5). "He that spareth his rod hateth his son; but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes" (Prov. 13:24). The Christian still having within him the old Adam and living in a sinful world needs the corrective chastening of the rod. "No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby" (Heb. 12:11). In the same chapter from the Letter to the Hebrews the Christian is told how he can bear up under the sorrows and trials of this life, to wit, "Looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. For consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds." (Vv. 2-3.) Writing to the Christians at Rome, Paul said: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us." (Rom. 5:1-5.) When Lazarus' sisters sent word

saying that their brother was sick, Jesus said: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby" (John 11:4). And though Jesus had permitted sickness to enter into the home of Mary and Martha and Lazarus, yet we read: "Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus" (v. 5). To the Christians at Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, who had endured much on account of their faith, Paul said, "We must through much tribulation enter into the Kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). Concerning the hardships and persecutions which His disciples would have to endure in this world, Jesus said: "These things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them" (John 16:4). Lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to Paul a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him. Paul besought the Lord thrice that this thing might depart from him, but the Lord said: "My grace is sufficient for thee, for My strength is made perfect in weakness." And Paul cheerfully submitted, saying: "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." (2 Cor. 12:7-9.) "The diamond," says Spurgeon, "has much cutting, but its value is increased thereby." The believer needs such visitations of God. See also Job 5:17; Ps. 119:67; 1 Pet. 1:3-7; 2 Cor. 4:16-18.

The patient endurance of affliction on the part of a Christian is also to be an example and encouragement unto others. The power of the Christian's faith is shown when the Christian can say with Job: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him" (Job 13:15). Furthermore, suffering and affliction gives unto fellow Christians an opportunity to serve, so that on the Day of Judgment they may hear the Savior say: "I was sick, and ye visited Me. . . . Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." (Matt. 25:36, 40.) What sinful arrogance, therefore, would it be on the part of the Christian to try to escape pain and suffering by saying to the Lord: "I want no more of your chastening discipline. I shall put a stop to it by cutting off my days here upon earth!" Perish the thought!

In the case of the ungodly, too, God has a good purpose in mind by letting sorrow and pain come to them. If they

despise the riches of God's goodness and forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth them to repentance (Rom. 2:4), then God inflicts upon them His *corrective* punishment (Lev. 26:14 ff.), for to these same people the Lord says: "If they shall confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they trespassed against Me, and that also they have walked contrary unto Me and that I also have walked contrary unto them and have brought them into the land of their enemies; *if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled*, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity, *then will I remember My covenant with Jacob and also My covenant with Isaac; and also My covenant with Abraham will I remember*; and I will remember the land" (Lev. 26:40-42).

In this connection we may well be reminded that those who have brought corruption into the Church have always been the spiritual leaders who had forsaken the truth of God's Word or who had never known it: in the days of Christ, the chief priests and the Pharisees and the scribes; in the days of Luther, the Pope and his Roman Catholic priesthood; in the days of later Germany, the rationalists and the higher critics; in our days, the Modernists. False teachings enter the pew by means of the pulpit. As the days go on, we can better understand and appreciate Walther's dictum: "Gott bewahre uns ein frommes Ministerium" (may God preserve unto us a pious ministry). Or as Luther said: "Es ist kein teurer Schatz noch edler Ding auf Erden und in diesem Leben denn ein rechter, treuer Pfarrer oder Prediger" (there is no greater treasure, nor anything more excellent upon this earth and in this life, than a true, faithful pastor or preacher). In the introduction to one of his sermons Whitefield has these words: "As God can send a nation or people no greater blessing than to give them faithful, sincere, and upright ministers, so the greatest curse that God can possibly send upon a people in this world is to give them over to blind, unregenerate, carnal, lukewarm, and unskillful guides. And yet, in all ages, we find that there have been many wolves in sheep's clothing, many that daubed with untempered mortar, that prophesied smoother things than God did allow. As it was formerly, so it is now; there are many that corrupt the Word of God and deal deceitfully with it."

St. Louis, Mo.

## Let's Not Forget the Teacher

By WM. A. KRAMER

In education, as in other pursuits, it is easy to lose oneself in matters of secondary importance. Educators are known to have followed a pet subject for more than a decade, until it seemed that the educational symphony had only one theme. It is enough here to recall the protracted and all-absorbing attention given to methods, tests and measurements, and curriculum revision, each in its turn. Important as these are, the teacher ought to occupy first place in the thoughts of educators at all times, because the success of any school hinges first of all on the teacher. Curriculum, methods, and measurement do not guide the impressionable minds and bodies of young children in their growth to spiritual, moral, social, and physical maturity. The teacher does. This article, then, is a frank appeal to give the teacher his rightful place in the scheme of education. The thought is especially of the Lutheran teacher.

Both congregations and teachers need to be reminded not to forget the teacher. It is easy to see that the congregation may forget its teacher, but, strange though it may seem, the teacher may forget himself with equally disastrous results.

Teachers are important. Take Martin Luther. Students came from all parts of Germany and Europe to sit in his classes, because he was an outstanding teacher with an outstanding message, which he presented in an outstanding way. Then these same students returned home to preach and teach what they had learned from the great teacher in Wittenberg. Even today people spare no expense or effort to study under a teacher who has the reputation of being great, be he a music teacher, education professor, or scientist. We are not surprised at that but think it natural to seek out great teachers in special fields. At the same time we do not always exert ourselves sufficiently to provide the type of teachers for our children that the great cause of Christian education demands. Often we do not supply the conditions which a potentially great Christian teacher requires for his proper development. We forget that a really great teacher in every schoolroom, from the seminaries and teachers' colleges on down to the



kindergarten, would solve most of our educational problems and many of our church problems very quickly.

A great Christian teacher need be neither a famous nor a flashy person, but he must be one who loves God and His Word, who believes firmly in his Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who loves children and the teaching of children, and who knows his subject matter. For such a person, method, measurement, and materials fall into their proper place naturally, and he will do the task that he is supposed to do. He will master the techniques that need to be mastered. He will see beyond the confused mass of subject matter and administrative detail, recognizing some of the simple things which an educator must do in order to teach children. He will see the children as individuals and recognize their needs. He will be the kind of person that will be fondly remembered by his pupils for years to come.

The quality of the teacher is influenced to such an extent by the conditions under which he is working that the same person may develop into a success or failure, depending upon the circumstances. Congenial working conditions generally make for better teachers. It is well for congregations to remember this when they expect great things of their teachers, and it is of first importance that they regard the teacher and his work so highly that he can maintain his self-respect and a proper respect for the calling which he has chosen for his life's work.

Men are so constituted by the Creator that they desire to be somebody. Nobodies are always unhappy people. Farmers, lawyers, doctors, pastors, teachers, housewives, all want to be somebodies. They want to feel that they are doing a worth-while task, that they are useful, that their work is appreciated. It is not pride to feel that way, but a simple requirement of human nature. This feeling is perfectly in keeping with the high estate to which man has been created. The point here is that also the teacher wants to be somebody. For the teacher to feel that he is somebody, he must have a high respect for his calling.

On first thought it is hard to understand why a teacher should not respect his calling. Do we not say in sermons that the calling of the Christian teacher is one of the greatest callings in the world? Is not teaching one of the cleanest and



most pleasant occupations? The school day has only seven hours, and in that are included recesses. The school year is short, and plenty of holidays and vacations are added for good measure. The average person works 245—250 days per year, the teacher only 180—190. But that is only part of the story. There is the preparation of lessons, the correction of papers, the writing of report cards, meetings with parents, canvasses for children, summer school, and in most congregations there are many additional duties that vary with each teacher, but that include playing for the church services, choir and band directing, Bible class or Sunday school teaching, teaching in the vacation Bible school, instructing Sunday school teachers, leading in young people's work, serving as congregational secretary, attending meetings and more meetings, until sometimes the teacher is run ragged and begins to wish for a year's vacation in the Ozarks. The Lutheran teacher works, and it does not take much effort to demonstrate the fact. But it is not the work that wears out teachers and makes them lose respect for their calling. Doctors, dentists, lawyers, pastors, and others also work, and they work hard; yet they respect their calling, principally for two reasons. People in the community respect their calling, and they are well paid, though the latter is not always true of the pastor. But at least his calling is respected in the congregation and in the community. In the case of the teacher the opposite is often true. Many people do not respect his calling, and too often he is not well paid.

It is true, of course, that the teacher's calling is frequently lauded; for instance, in educational sermons, at installation services, and on other occasions — perhaps more often during a teacher shortage than otherwise. But deep down in our synodical thinking there is ingrained some strange quirk of reasoning which interprets the teacher's call and calling in a way to discourage the teacher. He does not quite know whether he is fish or fowl, and the uncertainty has a disquieting effect upon him. Intelligent people want to know their place. They are in danger of becoming restless when their position is not properly defined. Even so there will always be many who are great enough to look beyond themselves to the cause in which they believe and which they serve, and these continue to be great teachers regardless of what others think. But not all teachers have that ability.

A criticism of our synodical reasoning with regard to the teacher may not be readily accepted. A calm consideration of the following facts will serve as partial evidence that something is wrong here. A few years ago it was not uncommon for church publications to contain appeals for higher pastoral salaries without so much as mentioning the teachers, who, as a rule, were less adequately paid. It still happens today, though less frequently. In discussing the doctrine of the call, great care is often taken to read every one but the pastor out of the office of the Word. Efforts are made to do this as painlessly as possible, but the success of these efforts is negligible. In meetings attended by both pastors and teachers it is almost a foregone conclusion that a pastor is chairman and a teacher secretary, though the ability of the persons in question might dictate a reversal of the offices. In salaries the difference between that of the pastor and the teacher has often been, and in some cases still is, too great. Pastors and laymen receive honorary degrees from our institutions of higher learning, often without having attended any university at all, while teachers with earned academic degrees and outstanding service to the Church, for instance, as long-time professors at teachers' colleges, have never been so recognized and honored. In the mailing of free materials from various departments of Synod, teachers have sometimes been overlooked to the detriment of the Church and the irritation of some teachers. The above are evidences, but not the only ones, that the teacher has not occupied the place in our synodical thinking that he ought to occupy. Somewhere along the line a reasoning has crept in which has tended to make him the forgotten man. This is not to deny that part of it may have been the teacher's fault, but certainly not all of it.

The cure for the condition is simple. If synodically we can take the step from lip service to actual appreciation of the teacher and his work, actually regarding his office as part of the ministry, without making a pastor of the teacher, we will have leaped the main hurdle. Then if we turn responsibility over to the teacher and permit him to develop and use his particular talents, we shall have a man who will love his calling and who will feel that he is engaged in a great work, as he is in truth. Let us stop forgetting the teacher and begin using the potential power that resides in two thousand con-

secrated people who can do great things if we give them the opportunity.

In congregations with a number of teachers the board of education ought to study the teachers' inclinations and abilities and the needs of the congregation, and with the teachers' consent assign to each of them some important phase of congregational work. Too often we fritter away our powers in many small and comparatively insignificant matters, or we load one teacher with so much work that he can hardly bear the burden. Why should the principal of a large school also be the organist and choir director, or vice versa? The principal has enough work with his principalship and teaching the upper grade or grades. The organist and choir director will develop faster and better if music is his only extra duty. Make someone else responsible for young people's work, someone else for the records of all members and mission prospects from birth to confirmation, and yet someone else for other important phases of congregational work, if there are enough teachers to go around. It is self-evident that all these assignments are to be executed in co-operation with the pastor, for the pastor is the head of the congregation.

With a good teacher in charge of a special phase of congregational work, the wise pastor will do little more than to inform himself that the work is being done right. As long as that is the case, he will be happy to be relieved of pressing duties, and he will give the teacher every opportunity to develop in his work and to use his initiative. If the teacher must go to the pastor for approval of every minor move, the teacher's initiative will be stifled, and he will not be able to perform creditable work. Between the pastor and the teacher there will be an understanding that special problems or new policies will be thoroughly discussed and agreed upon before action is taken. Then the teacher proceeds, assuming full responsibility, and the respect for his calling is correspondingly increased, both on the part of the congregation and on his own part. While care should be taken not to burden the teacher with too many duties besides teaching, every teacher ought to have some activity in which he deals with and directs adults. This will help him to keep a balanced view of life. The teacher should be held to report on his special activity to the voters periodically, and occasionally in writing in the

church periodical. This will keep the congregation informed, it will make for a better acquaintance between the members and teacher, and will help develop respect for his work and calling on the part of the congregation and the teacher himself. As this respect increases, it will not be too hard for the congregation to show the teacher also in a tangible financial way that his efforts are appreciated. Let's not forget the teacher. Synod and every congregation and individual in Synod should remember not to forget him. The Kingdom of Grace will profit from the greater service which the teachers will perform if they are not forgotten.

"Let's not forget the teacher" needs also to be told to the teacher himself. Much has been said about appreciation in the foregoing. While it is true that the teacher seeks recognition and that he is justified in doing so, he must be sure not to seek it in a sinful fashion. Acclaim by the congregation and the world is not what the Christian teacher wants. Flames, ropes, swords, and the guillotine have been the recognition of many a man of God who has left a permanent mark for good upon the Church and the world. The Christian teacher of today may be slated for a similar reward if the world keeps on its dizzy downward course, but that should not disturb anyone unduly. The teacher is here to serve God and man, not to seek acclaim and recognition. He must fight the sinful desires of his selfish heart, as every other Christian. Realizing that he is leading blood-bought souls on the way of life, he will not care much when ignorant or uninformed people despise him and his work. He knows in his own heart that he is serving God and man, and who can do more? Having food and raiment, he will be content, though he could use more of earthly goods to advantage. He will develop his abilities and let the Lord show him where to use them to the best advantage. He will look at the boys and girls before him and see the Church and the world of tomorrow, and in the thought that his faithful service will help to build a better church and world, he will gain new strength for the tasks of today. In the hurry and bustle of his daily work he will not neglect to go aside for those moments with God and His Word which renew his strength, so that he may walk and not faint.

Besides these, the wise teacher will do some of the prac-

tical things which will help to make his work more pleasant and less distracting. If he is serving in a congregation where every teacher is expected to attend every meeting and to take an active interest in every organization of the congregation except the ladies' aid — and there are some of that kind — he will frankly discuss the situation with the pastor, his colleagues, and the board of education, trying to find an arrangement that is more conserving of the teacher's time and energy. Considering that even a teacher who serves for 50 years has not many more than 100,000 hours of time to devote to his school and congregation, it is of the utmost importance that he use his time economically. The sands of this world are running out fast, and there is no time or energy to waste in the Kingdom of God.

Another way in which a teacher may increase his joy in his work is for him to engage in some kind of creative activity. This has really been covered in a general way in speaking of the development of talents and the assignment of duties according to natural gifts and preferences. Where talents and preferences are taken into consideration, some kind of creative work will almost surely develop. But the possibilities for creative work go beyond the immediate duties in the congregation. For example, many teachers have the ability to write for publication, but they do not use the talent. Occasional articles for the *Lutheran School Journal* perhaps come first to mind. The market is also crying for Christian literature of all kinds, and a teacher who begins to train himself for writing in his younger years will be able to do the Kingdom of God and himself great service. The need for textbooks and instructional materials in Lutheran schools is only beginning to be met, and it will be many years before it is satisfactorily supplied. Before that takes place, revisions of present books and materials will be necessary. There will be a constant need for many teachers to engage in the planning and writing of instructional materials. The *Lutheran Witness*, the *American Lutheran*, the *Walther League Messenger*, *Today*, the periodicals for young people and children, and even *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* are open to teacher authors. Why not give the urge to write a chance to develop along useful lines?



There are many outlets for the creative impulse besides writing: in music, art, neighborhood mission work, church publicity, schoolroom arrangement and decoration, and in many other ways, limited only by the teacher's initiative and endurance. The point is that every teacher should put all energy into his schoolwork that is required, but he should have at least one other activity which leads him into work with the adults of the congregation or the community, or which provides work different from the daily school routine. This will help the teacher to forget himself and his troubles, and at the same time it will raise the respect for his calling.

All that has been stated here is said in a spirit of helpfulness and in an effort to serve Christ and the Church by giving the teacher the place which he properly deserves. The congregation can do much through proper appreciation of the teacher's work, through provisions for congenial working conditions, and through an appropriate salary for the teacher. Synod can help by clarifying the status of the teacher as far as his call is concerned. But the teacher will have to do most of it. His own appraisal of his calling will determine to a large extent the joy which he finds in his work. If he is convinced in his own mind that he is called by God to minister to the children of the congregation and to such adult groups as he is assigned to teach, he will maintain the respect for his calling that is necessary to make him successful. He will thank God for his work, he will find a measure of appreciation among the people whom he serves, and he may even find appreciation in the form of material benefits. He who loves God the most will serve Him best, and God will also occasionally give the faithful teacher glimpses of blessings upon his labors, so that he may love his calling the more.

St. Louis, Mo.





---

## Homiletics

---

### Outlines on the Nitzsch Gospel Selections

#### REMINISCERE

LUKE 7:36-50

While in the midst of preparing the catechumens for confirmation, there comes to mind the memory of that sacred pledge to "renounce the devil and all his works and all his ways" and to "walk as it becometh the Gospel of Christ." Many who have made this profession of faith have since lapsed. Hence, realizing "that of ourselves we have no strength," we pray in today's collect on behalf of the catechumens and ourselves, "that we may be defended from all adversities," etc.

In order, then, that we may "abound more and more" in our efforts to walk so as "to please God" (the Epistle, 1 Thess. 4:1), let us seek to increase our love for Jesus by realizing how great is God's forgiveness of our sins, for, according to our text:

#### FAITH IN GOD'S GREAT PARDON IS PRODUCTIVE OF GREAT LOVE

##### *I. True faith is faith in a great pardon*

A. The story. Our text presents to us two characters: one, a Pharisee, self-righteous and without true faith, vv. 39, 45-49; the other, "a woman in the city, which was a sinner," v. 37, whose faith was genuine, v. 50. The Pharisee had invited Jesus to a meal, and this woman — as is not uncommon in the Orient (see Trench, *Parables*, p. 232, Note c) — visited as an onlooker and, standing behind the reclining Savior, washed, kissed, and anointed His feet as they were turned toward her on the divan before the table, vv. 37-38. When the Pharisee doubted Christ's standing as a prophet, v. 39, Jesus, knowing his thoughts, v. 40, told the Parable of the Two Debtors, vv. 40-43, and thereby taught two very important lessons.

B. The first lesson: True faith is faith in a great pardon.

1. The woman had such faith.

a. She realized that her sins were many and great. Our Lord compared them, v. 41, to a debt of five hundred denarii, or \$85.00 in American money, a large sum when we realize

that it took a workman of that day almost two years to earn it.

b. These "many sins" were forgiven her: "frankly" (lit. "freely"), v. 42; completely, v. 47; by the Lord Jesus Himself, vv. 48-49; as a gift through faith, v. 50; so that she could go home with a comforted heart and a peaceful conscience, v. 50 b.

c. She believed, therefore, that she had received a great pardon. She showed it by her "much love," v. 47. (Note: the meaning is not, "her sins . . . were forgiven, *because* she loved much," which is contrary to the context, vv. 42 b-43; but, "her sins, being many, were forgiven, *as is evident from the fact that she loved much*").

2. We, too, accept forgiveness as a great gift of grace, for

a. We are great sinners, Rom. 3:9-23; James 2:1-10 (even favoritism makes one guilty of the whole Law, vv. 9-10); Gen. 6:5; 8:21; Is. 64:6; John 3:6; Rom. 7:18; 8:7.

b. But Christ also has taken away our many and great sins, John 1:29 (a task completed on the Cross, John 19:20); 1 Tim. 2:6; 1 John 2:1-2; having pardoned them all, Rom. 5:18; 2 Cor. 5:19.

c. This manifold, universal forgiveness is offered us freely, v. 42; Rom. 3:24; and by grace, Eph. 2:8-9; in the Gospel, Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:47; Eph. 2:4-9.

d. It is accepted through faith alone, v. 50; Rom. 3:26-30; 4:5; Gal. 2:16.

e. It is a truly great pardon.

The second lesson of our Savior's parable is this, that

## II. True faith is productive of great love

A. Simon, the Pharisee, had no such faith, v. 39, and consequently was unproductive of love toward Jesus, vv. 44-46, for, Heb. 11:6; John 15:4-5.

B. The woman, however, had this faith, and therefore showed forth great love, vv. 43 and 47.

1. She manifested her love by lamenting her sins, vv. 38, 48-50; by unashamedly and humbly confessing Christ before others, v. 38; and by sacrificing her best, vv. 37-38, to honor Him.

2. This love was the fruit of her faith, as is indicated by our Savior's question, v. 42; by Simeon's answer, v. 43 a,

which met with the Lord's approval, v. 43 b; and by Christ's application of the parable, vv. 44-47.

C. Our faith, too, will manifest itself similarly, Ps. 51:17; Gen. 32:10; Luke 18:10-14; 1 Tim. 1:15; Eph. 3:8; Matt. 10:32; Rom. 10:9-10; Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 9:14; Gal. 6:6-7; for faith invariably produces love, James 2:17, 20, 26; Gal. 5:6, love for God and our fellow men, Matt. 22:36-40; 1 John 4:19-21, 7-11; 5:1-3.

Conclusion: How often Satan, the world, and our flesh hinder us from producing love! How frequently we, like the Pharisee, sin against love! Realizing this, we cry with today's Introit: "Remember, O Lord, Thy tender mercies and loving-kindnesses. . . . I trust in Thee"; and oh, how good to hear Christ assure us again: "Thy sins be forgiven thee"; "thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." Believing this, may we abound in love. Amen.

THEODORE NICKEL

## OCULI

LUKE 10:17-22

Passiontide is a sad season! We contemplate the bitter suffering of our Lord; we know and confess that we have caused it with our sins. Yet to the two sad disciples going to Emmaus the Lord said: Luke 24:17; and when they told Him He answered: vv. 25-26. — At first glance our text seems a strange text for Lent — the Seventy come with joy; Jesus tells them to rejoice; He Himself rejoices and sends a prayer of thanksgiving to the Father. Yet it is a true Lenten text; but it speaks of results, of victory. — So Jesus today says to us: In this Lenten season

### REJOICE!

- I. *Because I have defeated Satan for you*
- II. *Because your names are written in heaven*
- III. *Because God has revealed this to you*

### I

Jesus sent the Seventy to prepare the people for His coming, giving them explicit instructions and promises (vv. 2-16 of this chapter). He had told them that they were going as

lambs among wolves. They came back and reported that in His name they had overcome even the mightiest enemies, the devils. Jesus affirms that Satan has no longer power to withstand him who comes in Jesus' name; he is fallen from his high estate; Jesus "beheld him falling" — He defeated him.

Christ's promise to the Seventy is given to all who confess His name. "The old evil Foe" will to the end "mean deadly woe" to them, with all the agents who aid him and the agencies he uses; but neither spiritual nor physical serpents and scorpions shall be able to hurt them; no, not even if in the end they die as martyrs. Nor shall Satan be able to hinder their work when they go to carry out the great commission "Preach the Gospel." Even though "deep guile and great might," etc. David slew Goliath in the name of the Lord. True, "with might of ours," etc. "But for us fights," etc. "Though devils all the world," etc.

An unspeakably great, a divine promise: v. 19. Jesus means to encourage us for the never-ceasing battle with the Evil One; and He says: Rejoice! You are sure of victory!

## II

And yet there is a slight rebuke in the Lord's answer, v. 20a. Did He see a danger in this joy of the Seventy, pride in their accomplishment rather than joy in this, that people had come to accept their message of salvation? Basis of a Christian's joy is that his name is written in heaven and that he can bring this message to others: It is again possible that your names will be written there.

Yes, God has a book in which are written the names of all who will inherit the kingdom of heaven (Dan. 12:1; Phil. 4:3; Rev. 20:12). This book might have been a record of all men, for God wants all men to enter glory. Man changed that; on that sad day (Gen. 3) the book was closed, and the angel with the sword was set to watch the entrance to life. But God in His mercy has again opened that book; and there are in that book the names of those who have been cleansed of their sins by the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 3:5; 13:8; 21:27); for: 1 John 7:7. When a sinner in faith accepts the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, his name is written in heaven; and then — here is true joy! — Heb. 12:22-24; no power on earth or in hell can blot out those names.

## III

How do we know all this? V. 21. Again a cause for rejoicing. This is not a matter of human experience, but of divine revelation. All the wise and prudent with all their research and investigation could not discover who God is (Job 37:23), what His attitude is toward men (no heathen ever dared to think of a gracious God!); much less could they know of the Gospel way of the forgiveness of sin through the vicarious atonement of the Son of God (Rom. 16:25). To men it is all a mystery, a secret which they cannot fathom; God must reveal it.

And God has revealed it (Matt. 13:11; 16:17); and that not in such a way that only the wise and prudent may understand it, but so that babes in age and understanding may grasp it; in fact, those who are wise in their own conceit and proud of it, proud of their own ability and accomplishment, will forever miss it; but to those who, like children, take God at His word, take their reason captive under the obedience of faith, to them the mystery is solved (1 Cor. 1:18-25). They know God, their heavenly Father, and His Son, their Savior.

For that we owe God everlasting thanksgiving. And that is the source of never-ending joy to us, a joy on which we dwell in every season of the church year, particularly, however, in Lent, when we consider specially the great culmination of this revelation of God, the working out of the mystery of salvation in the suffering and death of His Son.

Luke 10:23-24. — Thank God, we see and hear what they saw and heard! May God give us grace to accept it in the same childlike spirit and with the same joy!

THEO. HOYER

## LAETARE

JOHN 8:12-20

Time: Feast of Tabernacles. Davis: "It was also customary in the evening following the first day of the festival, and perhaps on the subsequent evenings, to illuminate the court of the women from two lofty stands, each supporting

four immense lamps, which threw their light not only into the courts of the Temple, but far and wide over the city." Symbolized the pillar of fire which led Israel out of Egypt. In the midst of this festival Jesus calls out: v. 12.

## CHRIST THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD

### I

*He gives light to the world.*

a. Implications. One implication behind this claim is that the world is in darkness. But is it? The world does not think so. Believes it can solve its own problems if it can only get the co-operation of others. Only a few years ago man thought he had the answer in science. "Side by side with the growth of science, which is also the basis of material prosperity and unification of the world, has come a steady deepening of human sympathy, and the extension of it to all weak and suffering things. . . . Science, founding a firmer basis for the co-operation of mankind, goes widening down the centuries, and sympathy and pity bind the courses together." (F. S. Marvin, *The Living Past*, 1923, p. 270.) Now man is generally agreed that civilization is sick and that science may actually be catapulting the world to its destruction. Some are frantically working at treaties, world government, economic adjustments and arrangements, and fail to see that these are merely symptoms. Others sense that the trouble is somewhere beneath the surface, and they are earnestly searching for a power which can change the attitude of man to man. Yet in its blindness the world cannot dig deep enough to get at the root of sin. In the face of this groping in darkness, Jesus says, "I am the Light of the world."

A second implication is Christ's deity. Light symbolized God, Gen. 15:17; Ex. 3:5; 14:20; Ps. 27:1. Used also of the Messiah and understood as such by the rabbis, Is. 9:2; 60:1-3; 49:6b. Hence Simon says: Luke 2:32, and John writes: chap. 1:1-14. Pharisees understood this claim and therefore challenged Him, vv. 13-19.

b. How is Christ the Light? He knows the darkness of civilization, its sickness. He knows that behind the strife, disaster, and corruption is the darkness of sin, which has benighted man's heart. He shines into our heart to show us the existing sickening darkness.



He is the Light of Truth to show us God — His love and His plan of salvation. He is not simply a map to tell us to look for the way out, but the Light to follow out of the darkness to the eternal light of glory.

He is the Light that heals the soul's sickness and the festering sores which have taken their corrupting hold in the darkness.

He is the Light that gives life. Human knowledge without this Light can only fetter men more securely in their blindness.

He is the Light that tells us what good works are.

## II

*His followers walk in light.*

Christians also have the title "light of the world," Matt. 5:14. It implies that they have been called out of darkness.

They are knowers of the truth. With this light they know where they are going. But do we believe that we have this light? Why do we walk uncertainly as though we believed the world and would follow its marsh lights?

They live in light. Matt. 5:15-16; Eph. 5:8; 1 Thess. 5:5-8.

They are givers of light. 2 Cor. 4:6; 1 Pet. 2:9. It is urgent that they pass this light on. How sorely the world needs this light! Why is it that Christians are not aware that the world is engaged in a race with catastrophe? It is the quality of light to give light.

Would you have more light? Then turn to His Word. Ps. 19:8; Prov. 6:23.

*Conclusion.* Hymn 277:3.

ARTHUR C. REPP

## JUDICA SUNDAY

JOHN 11:41-53

With Thee is the fountain of life (Ps. 36:9; Jer. 2:13; 17:13; John 4:10, 14; Is. 55:1; 12:3-4).

### JESUS, THE FOUNTAIN OF LIFE

*I. Abolishing our death*

*II. By His death*

#### I

If Lazarus was not dead, then Jesus did not raise him from the dead. To arrest and block doubt, it is important first to prove the fact of Lazarus' death. Unbelief denies the resurrec-

tion of Lazarus also in view of successful experiments in applied breath control and in view of medical experiments in revivification. In all these cases life had not ceased, and *rigor mortis* had not set in.

The death of Lazarus is attested by pronouncements of the Holy Spirit (vv. 41, 44); of Jesus (vv. 14, 25); of the sisters (vv. 21, 32); of the comforters (vv. 19, 37). Furthermore, time, and the offensive condition of the body (v. 39), proves that this was not a case of catalepsy or asphyxia or breath control. The enemies do not deny the miracle (v. 47). The glory of God (v. 40) is revealed and promoted only by truth, never by deception. Lazarus was dead.

He was dead because he was mortal; a mortal, because, like us, a sinner; a sinner, he must, like us, accept the wages (Rom. 6:23a; Gen. 3:19; Rom. 5:12; Heb. 9:27). This is the application of the Law.

He was dead, because the glory of God should be revealed by his death and resurrection (v. 40; 2 Cor. 4:11; 5:1-5). This is the application of the Gospel (Num. 23:10).

For these very reasons also, Jesus, who was about to make an exchange with Lazarus, had a right to the grave of His friend. At His command the grave was opened. In this tense moment Jesus hallowed the grave by His presence and by prayer to His Father. It is a prayer of praise and thanksgiving; of intercession; glorifying both the Father and the Son; to the welfare and for the instruction of the people; revealing the purposes of the miracle. Christians desire such prayer at their graves.

The majestic word which challenged death and the amazing act of Christ's power should be presented reverently, not sensationally dramatized. Death releases the dead at the command of Jesus; and Lazarus, yet bound hand and foot, emerges out of the grave, is loosed of the graveclothes. Jesus is the Fountain of Life and abolishes death.

Christians are wary of fiction and caricatures designed to pollute the Fountain of Life, such as they read of, for instance, in "*The Nazarene*" (Shalom Asch) on the raising of Lazarus: "a corpse set in motion"; "alive or dead, or both, the long, shriveled body reeked of the grave"; "yellow-ashen face . . . the aspect of an empty skull above the covered leanness of a

skeleton . . . legs moved stiffly, like wooden supports." — Lazarus lived a normal life after his resurrection, for the mark of Christ's miracles on body and soul is their completeness and perfection.

Thus Jesus taught by deed His word of life, that we should have faith, hope, comfort in Him, (vv. 41-42, 26, 40; Rom. 6: 23; 1 Cor. 15: 55-58; John 10: 28; 14: 19; 1 Thess. 4: 18).

## II

The miracle was of such importance as to necessitate a special session of the rulers. This is the common procedure of the enemies. This protocol reminds us of Psalm 2. The spiritually dead would check the flow of life to save their own cause of deceit and greed unto death. Their own leader contemptuously sneers at their consternation and impotence, and pompously he suggests the destruction of the Life: Stop the Source! Kill the Life-Giver! Seal the Fountain! This seemed profitable for himself and for those in power with him and in league with Rome, and expedient for the Jewish nation — a plausible argument of deceit and selfishness. To lend weight to his murderous plan, the diplomat invoked his office and dignity as though he were God's oracle. And so they condemned the Fountain of Life to death, with satanic deliberation, before they called Him to trial (v. 53).

But the Holy Spirit also attended that session. Unconsciously Caiphas was His instrument. Caiphas was to make this utterance, into which the Holy Spirit placed the divine sense and meaning, because Jesus (1) should die for that nation and (2) establish the united Kingdom and household of God. The prophecy teaches the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God (Acts 2: 23); the universality of the redemption; the vicarious atonement.

And so it came to pass that the Fountain of Life abolished our death and sealed its doom by His shameful but vicarious, victorious death (2 Tim. 1: 10), that we now see His glory (v. 40) at the graves of His believers and then, in the glory of the resurrection (v. 24), behold the glory of His gracious countenance (John 17: 24).

G. H. SMUKAL

---

## PALM SUNDAY

JOHN 12:1-19

Jesus had sincere, loyal friends, e. g., John the Baptist, Martha and Mary, John and Peter, etc. Why not? Will not a good man gain true friends, disciples, and followers? But, strange as it may seem, Jesus also had bitter enemies. We naturally ask: Why? In our text we have the answer to our question:

## WHY DID HIS ENEMIES HATE JESUS?

## I

*Because of His words and works.*

a. If we read this text only, we may at first get the impression that the miracle of raising Lazarus from the dead aroused the ill will of these Jewish priests against Jesus. However, we dare not forget what had happened before Jesus performed this miracle. In the chapters which precede we read of a number of disputes between Jesus and these Jews. In these Jesus had reproved them for their pride, hypocrisy, greed, and self-righteousness. Cf. John 8:40-59; see also Matt. 23:13 ff. *These words* of Jesus aroused their hatred (note Matt. 21:45).

b. Now, when Jesus substantiated His claims by this miracle, their fury knew no bounds. These evident divine powers convicted them (John 3:2). A few, very few (Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea), became disciples of Jesus, but the majority hated Him all the more. He had "stopped their mouths"; now they would use force. Behold their fury, v. 10.

That has always been the way of the enemies of the truth. Cf. Jer. 37:16 and Jer. 38:6; Acts 22:21-25. The Apostles experienced the same hatred. Luther. Today. Matt. 10:18-24; Gal. 4:16.

## II

Another cause of the hatred against Jesus was *the failure of His enemies to prevent His wonderful success.*

a. In spite of all that they had done, His disciples clung to Him, and many women were devoted to Him, e. g., Mary, vv. 1-3. Cf. Luke 8:2-3. Later, Christians were persecuted because they clung so tenaciously to the worship of Jesus.

b. Then His enemies saw that His following continued to

increase. They themselves had to acknowledge that all their efforts against Him had failed, v. 19. Cf. John 11:47 and 53; Matt. 27:18. Jealous rage drove them to use even so despicable a traitor as Judas. What shameful conduct in religious leaders, to make use of so contemptible a liar (v. 5) and thief (v. 6)!

Behold, Jesus is hated because of His goodness and because He saves the poor out of the clutches of the cruel and deceitful. John 8:46.

Surely we do not wish to join the company of Judas and the enemies of Jesus! But remember, here no neutrality is possible. Matt. 12:30; Matt. 10:37.

Hymn: 334.

MARTIN S. SOMMER



---

## Miscellanea

---

### Fellowship Among Lutherans

Address to the American Lutheran Conference  
Nov. 14, 1946, Rockford, Ill.

By J. W. BEHNKEN

The invitation of your program committee to speak to the American Lutheran Conference on the topic "Fellowship Among Lutherans" reached me last week. I have been requested to speak very frankly on this vital and important issue. This is a topic which has been under discussion for almost a century. During the past decade this matter again occupied the intensive attention of Lutherans in America. However, though some progress was made in certain sections, unity has not been achieved. Every one deeply regrets this and is willing to contribute everything within his power toward its accomplishment. For that reason I rejoice to be given an opportunity to speak on this important question and set forth what we of the Missouri Synod consider essential toward the accomplishment of fellowship among Lutherans.

We must know exactly what we mean by the term "fellowship." We are now not speaking about social fellowship. Nor do we have in mind so-called intellectual fellowship. We mean religious fellowship. Let me narrow it down even more than that. We do not have in mind the fellowship of all believers, a fellowship which binds together all Christians by faith in Christ, a fellowship which embraces all the saints in heaven and every believer on earth, a fellowship which has been called the *una sancta*, the communion of saints, the invisible Church. In the discussion before us we are speaking about a fellowship between Lutherans belonging to visible churches, a fellowship between Lutheran church bodies, a fellowship which has been termed pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship.

It is a pity that the Lutheran Church is so divided. No person interested in the Lutheran Church can remain indifferent about this. To Lutherans has been granted the heritage of *sola Scriptura*, *sola gratia*, *sola fide*. Through the remarkable work of His servant Luther, God brought to light again Scriptural truth and Scriptural practice. As a result the Lutheran Church enjoys an incomparably glorious blessing. But how must it affect the heart of Jesus when He beholds such disunity and dissension among the people unto whom He has entrusted the marvelous blessings of the Reformation. Similarly it affects many thousand Lutherans. It hurts; it cuts deep gashes; it makes the heart bleed to think that in view of the unparalleled heritage of the Reformation Lutherans should be so divided.

Ninety years ago negotiations were undertaken to bring Lutherans in America together on the basis of clear-cut Scriptural



doctrine. They found their origin in the question propounded by the sainted Dr. Walther in *Lehre und Wehre*, in January, 1856, whether a meeting could not be arranged between all Lutheran synods which acknowledge and confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of 1530 as the pure and correct interpretation of Holy Writ. The purpose was to be the possible establishment of one united Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America. The suggestion found favor. The *Lutheran Standard* then issued a call for such a meeting. This call was published by all English, Norwegian, and German language periodicals which were friendly to the cause. As a result, meetings were conducted in Columbus, Ohio, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Cleveland, Ohio, and Fort Wayne, Indiana, each lasting a number of days. One article after the other of the Augsburg Confession was thoroughly discussed. The minutes of the very first meeting held in Trinity Church in Columbus state clearly that those present sought to assure themselves that all present were one in faith and confession and that they actually subscribed to the various articles, not only in their essential and substantial parts, but in all features according to the very wording of the articles.

This is the essential requisite for wholesome and God-pleasing fellowship among Lutherans today. There must be genuine unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Only if Lutherans build on this foundation will the structure of Lutheranism stand. It will crumble and fall if the foundation is faulty and defective. That is the position of the Missouri Synod today. We are vitally interested in the cause of Lutheran fellowship. We pray for it. We want to put forth every effort toward its achievement. However, it must be on sound, solid, Scriptural foundations.

I realize that we have been accused of overemphasizing the need of doctrinal unity, but you cannot get away from the fact that the Word of God throughout emphasizes doctrinal unity. The history of the early Christian Church clearly shows what emphasis was placed upon doctrinal unity. God-appointed leaders in the Apostolic Church issued earnest warnings against false doctrines. Read the Ecumenical Creeds, especially the Athanasian Creed, and note the precise and exact language used. There can be no doubt that the early Church sought to safeguard soundness of doctrine. Or think of the Lutheran Confessions. Much time and effort were spent to express things so definitely and precisely that there should be no misunderstanding. Think especially of the Formula of Concord. Years were spent in its formulation before it was adopted. Then, however, it settled the controversial issues, removed the dissension, and safeguarded sound, Biblical doctrine. Even so today the paramount need is that Lutherans wholeheartedly and consecratedly unite on the basis of sound, Biblical doctrine. Such agreement and unity must be reached, not only between official committees but also out in the field between pastors and between members of our congregations.

There are those who have grown tired of doctrinal discussions. Some have claimed that we have unity, since Lutherans in America by resolutions have subscribed to the Lutheran Confessions. It is true that doctrinal discussions in some places have revealed that much has been accomplished. However, it is also true that some doctrinal discussions have revealed a decided lack of doctrinal unity. What shall be done, then? Instead of growing weary of doctrinal discussions, those who desire a genuine Lutheran fellowship should realize that this necessitates a deeper study of Biblical doctrine and the Lutheran Confessions and a frank, but friendly, discussion of the doctrinal differences which have been keeping us apart, so that with God's help and under His blessings doctrinal unity might be reached.

It grieves a person whose heart is interested in genuine unity that there are those who would brush aside doctrinal discussion and boldly claim that agreement has been reached, since we subscribe to the Lutheran Confessions. It grieves a person very much to hear that men are not willing to consider further doctrinal theses. It grieves a person to be told that this way to doctrinal unity is closed.

Today efforts are being put forth toward fellowship via co-operation. Co-operative efforts have been proclaimed and heralded as harbingers of Lutheran fellowship and Lutheran union. Let me speak very frankly. If such co-operation involves joint work in missions, in Christian education, in student welfare work, in joint services celebrating great events, then co-operation is just another name for pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship. Without doctrinal agreement, this spells compromise. It means yielding in doctrinal positions. Such fellowship will not stand in the light of Scripture. You realize, of course, that Missouri has been co-operating in externals in matters which do not involve pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship. Such co-operation should not and must not be interpreted as a step toward fellowship or a method of bringing about fellowship among Lutherans. Fellowship among Lutherans is possible and Biblical only where there is agreement in Biblical doctrine and Scriptural practice. Where such agreement has been reached, pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship will necessarily follow.

Efforts have been made to effect intersynodical lay organizations. We are told that these organizations are to be of social and civic character and that they will avoid any attempt to become pressure groups which will demand Lutheran union. However, there too some have become so enthusiastic as to call this a real step in the direction of fellowship among Lutherans. Some have said that now we are getting down to the real issues, for in this way Lutheran union will emanate from the grass roots. Someone said that the past was the period for the clergy and the future is the day of the laity. Concerning the non-achievement of Lutheran union someone said that the fault must be sought not in the pew but in the pulpit. We must carefully avoid every effort to pit the laymen against the clergy or the clergy against the laymen. God

forbid that the impression should go out that the preachers have been blocking the cause of Lutheran unity. Let us guard against any indictment of those who have stood for Scriptural principles. We know that God has explicitly outlined the duties of His watchmen, and God uses some strong language in that connection. The Lord wants preachers who are loyal to His cause, who will not deviate in the least from any part of His Word, who will defend every jot and tittle of it, who will insist that the Church continue in sound doctrine. On the other hand, God wants laymen who continue in His Word, who believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Efforts toward fellowship among Lutherans must never become a lay movement nor a clergy movement, but a church movement. It must find its grass roots not in the laity, not in the clergy, but in Scripture itself.

Another important feature which we must heed if fellowship among Lutherans is to be achieved is that church bodies practice thorough Scriptural discipline, brotherly discipline both in matters of doctrine and in matters of practice. This business of preaching doctrine not in harmony with God's Word cuts deep bloody gashes into the body of the visible Church. Such as are guilty should be admonished by their brethren in a spirit of love. Love demands this. Love never closes an eye to indifference in doctrine but uncovers the fault and with God's help corrects it. True Christian love is not spineless but has a very firm backbone. Just think of the love which Jesus manifested toward Peter when He said to him, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Or think of the firmness of Christ's love when He asked Peter that heart-searching question, thrice repeated: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" Think of the bold and firm love which prompted St. Paul to withstand Peter to the face when the latter had become guilty of hypocrisy. Even so our love must prompt us to uncover any false doctrine which we may find in any of our brethren.

Furthermore, doctrine definitely must be followed by practice. Indescribable harm has been done the cause of Lutheran fellowship when men become guilty of unionistic services, whereby they create impressions that after all there is no difference or that the differences are of little moment. Then, too, laxity and indifference over against the Christless secret orders should be mentioned. Irreparable damage is done not only to individual souls but to the cause of Lutheranism wherever a lax and indifferent practice obtains. Such practice definitely delays and hinders fellowship among Lutherans. I realize that most Lutherans subscribe to the principle: "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran pastors, and Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants." However, it is common knowledge that only too often there are violations of this principle and no disciplinary action is taken. That hurts. That places barriers before the efforts toward genuine Lutheran unity. That shuts the door. How can we who want to be conscientious in upholding the principles of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions

be expected to fellowship with those who sanction such unionistic practices and are indifferent to secret orders? \*

Today three definite streams, divergent streams, are visible in the Christian Church. The Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Catholic streams. Certainly there can be no thought of any effort to bring the waters of Lutheranism and Catholicism together. The Roman Catholic waters are muddy and poisonous. The very fundamental issue of spiritual life is denied there. An anathema is pronounced upon all such as dare to teach that man is saved solely by faith. The most precious gem entrusted to the Church, "Justification by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith," is denied. The Gospel is emasculated. The sacrament of Christ's body and blood is mutilated. Mary and other saints are worshiped, etc. Hence we must guard against all Romanizing tendencies.

On the other hand, there cannot be a confluence of the streams of Lutheranism and Calvinism. The waters of Calvinism are also dangerously muddy and contaminated. We know that in some of these churches there is great insistence upon immersion as the only mode of Baptism, and in practically none of them is there any emphasis upon the importance and benefits of Baptism. We know, too, that the Reformed churches deny the real presence in the Lord's Supper. To them the bread and the wine are merely symbols of Christ's body and blood or merely represent the body and blood of our Redeemer. They deny that Baptism saves and that the Lord's Supper conveys the forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation. In fact, the Reformed churches do not admit that the Gospel and the Sacraments are means of grace, vehicles of God to bring us the great blessings which Jesus has earned for us.

Unfortunately, so-called Modernists have crept into the Reformed churches. At first they sought only tolerance, then equal rights. But now they have reached the stage where they dominate things in sectarian circles. In the Federal Council of Churches of Christ these Modernists attempt to voice the opinions of all Protestantism. They do not, they cannot, they must not speak for Lutherans. I know that some have advocated some kind of connection with the Federal Council of Churches. I want to plead with every ounce of strength that God has given me that Lutherans in America may steer clear of any such sinful entangling alliances. Such practice positively shuts the door toward fellowship for Lutherans who wish to adhere to the doctrines of the Bible as set forth in our Lutheran Confessions. The very fact that the Federal Council of Churches has arrogated unto itself the prerogative of speaking for all Protestants presents a mighty argument why Lutherans should strive for genuine Biblical unity in order that there may be fellowship and unity among them and that they may speak for themselves.

---

\* Here I stated that we are conscious of the fact that there are a few sore spots in our midst, but that we are conscientiously putting forth efforts to remove them.

Before I close, let me add a final earnest and fervent plea for an honest and conscientious effort toward doctrinal unity among Lutherans. I have reference to the pathetic situation in Europe. It was my privilege a year ago to spend seven weeks in Europe. During most of this time we attempted to survey church conditions in the land of the Reformation. I met a number of the bishops of the *Landeskirche*. I met some of the leaders in the Free Churches. I spoke to a number of theological professors. I met Pfarrer Niemöller and interviewed him for more than two hours. I know of the tremendous influence which Barthian theology has exerted upon the Church in Europe. I am acquainted with the mighty efforts on the part of the Reformed elements in Europe to Calvinize Germany and other Lutheran countries. I am convinced that Lutheranism in Germany is at the crossroads. There are leaders and clergymen who are very eager to return to Luther, to the Lutheran Confessions, to the Bible. I heard from their own lips statements as positive, as loyal, as determined, and as heroic as I have ever heard from any one in our own Church. However, these people are in a sorry plight. The situation is tragic. Very few pastors have libraries. Men are actually starving because of a lack of sound theological literature. The Barthian group is busy. The Reformed element is very active and even militant. They are providing a set of theological books, but we were told that there is not a Lutheran book among them. Bishop Meiser, Dr. Stroh, Dr. Sasse, and others begged us to provide Symbolical Books, dogmatics, treatises, exegetical books, and the like for them. In this connection let me say that last Thursday a letter from Dr. Bodensieck reached me. I notice that the good doctor corroborates what we found concerning the militancy of the Barthian group. He wrote: "The men in this camp are accusing Luther and Lutheran doctrine of being responsible for the rise of totalitarianism, the rise of Hitler, etc. They say that these terrible things occurred because the Lutherans distinguished between Law and Gospel and separated these two and because they taught a definite *Reihenfolge* of the two. They declare that the Lutheran teaching concerning the Law and Gospel is the basic error; once this error is removed, other problems will be easily solved." Then follows a plea from Dr. Bodensieck that we might supply every German pastor with a copy of the sainted Dr. Walther's book on the proper distinction between Law and Gospel.

I have mentioned these things because I deeply feel the spiritual distress of the people in the land where once stood the cradle of the Reformation. I shall never be able to erase from my memory the classic welcome address delivered to us by Bishop Meiser before a group of fifty Pfarrer and many laymen in which he referred to the help given our Lutherans by Pfarrer Loehe and the Bavarians about a hundred years ago and how he then turned to me and said, "Now the tables are turned. Now we are begging; and we plead that you do not fail us." What a fervent, touching plea! Can we, dare we, fail them? I might as well ask: Is the



cause of Lutheranism dear to us? If it is, we Lutherans in America should unite on the basis of sound, Biblical, doctrine and Scriptural practice. That is the only proper kind of Lutheran unity. Then we would be able to enjoy wholehearted fellowship among Lutherans in America. Then we would be in a position to cooperate wholeheartedly and could unitedly help fellow Lutherans in Europe to withstand the avalanche of Calvinism which threatens such destruction in this hour of crisis.

### Justification in Luther's Theology

"I believe that the supreme need of the Church today is the recovery of the doctrine of Justification by Faith. For some this will mean the discovery of something never before realized, for others the putting in its right place of a truth which had become secondary and largely lost its meaning. This truth is absolutely primary, and the history of the Christian Church shows that when Justification by Faith has been prominently emphasized and proclaimed, there has been vigorous life and strong progress."

So wrote the Bishop of Sodor & Man in the first 1946 issue of *The Record*, quoted in the February 15 issue by the Rev. R. S. Dean, who goes on:

That statement is true both as to its assertion and its conclusion. The doctrine of Justification is such that it can have meaning only when it is made primary; it is a foundation stone, and not an architectural embellishment; it is a first necessity, and not an optional appendage. It comes first, or it comes nowhere. As to its effect when it is given its rightful place, history makes its own incontrovertible witness, for the tide of continuing progress and vigorous life runs most firmly in those who have clearly enunciated it, Paul, Augustine, Luther, Colet, and Wesley being only some of the names that spring to mind. And that luminous truth is given sharp and clear focus at the present time by the commemoration of the Fourth Centenary of the death of Martin Luther on February 18, one of whom, John Wesley, could speak as "a man highly favored of God, and a blessed instrument in His hand." Nowhere is the doctrine of Justification by Faith given more vivid, trenchant, and passionate expression than in the writings of Luther. If that doctrine lies at the heart of Paul's realization of the Gospel of Redeeming Love, it is only true to say of Luther, "It was his especial privilege to have entered into the spirit of St. Paul as none before him—not even St. Augustine. Luther's theology is Pauline theology in the language of modern times."

But we misunderstand Luther, as indeed we misunderstand Paul, if we look upon him as a coldly academic theologian. His is a doctrine of the heart and couched in the terms which befit it; massive it may be; profound it certainly is; but its significance lies not so much in its scope and profundity as in its character as the expression of a deep, revolutionary personal experience nurtured in travail of soul before birth is given to the peace which proceeds only from God and from His activity in the human heart.



If it is theology, it is theology on fire, as it was with Paul and was again to be with Wesley, and fire has an avidity and eagerness which cannot wait to be orderly. Here in Luther is the extravagant phraseology, the oft incoherence and scorn of grammar which cannot stay for the slower processes and niceties of polished language; the words of Jeremiah are equally true of "the solitary monk who shook the world" — "his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay," and if he could continue Jeremiah's experience and say: "I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side," then that did but add fuel to the flame of a passionate conviction. . . .

It can only have been the hand of God upon him that led him to turn to Augustine and more and more to Paul until the core was reached in Romans and Galatians, for it was "as Luther meditated on the pregnant phrase 'the just shall live by faith' that his shackles fell from him." It is significant indeed that his New Testament commentaries are written on precisely those books which contain that liberating sentence. . . .

We shall never understand his lyrical joy at realizing Justification until we have shared his experience of the grave and serious nature of sin. . . . If therefore "the supreme need of the Church today is the recovery of the doctrine of Justification by Faith," its complementary need is a realization of sin, which does not stop short at the shallow level of those acts which society may conceivably call sin. Harnack expresses this plainly when he says: "No one before Luther took so serious a view of sin as he did, the reason being that he measured it by faith, that is to say, took a *religious* estimate of it, and did not let himself be disturbed in this view by looking upon sins as the graduated manifestations of morality, or upon virtues as the manifold forms of worldly morality. He alone seized again at the Pauline proposition 'that whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' . . .

He could say with a warmth no printed words can impart: "Who is able to express what a thing it is, when a man is assured in his heart that God neither is nor will be angry with him, but will be forever a merciful and loving Father unto him for Christ's sake? This is indeed a marvelous and incomprehensible liberty."

Marvelous and incomprehensible indeed — the more vividly realized because it is not of man at all, but is itself a direct gift from God. It was while reading St. Paul's Epistles, and especially the Epistle to the Romans, that he grasped the essence of the matter: to quote Harnack again: "What he here learned, what he laid hold of as *the one thing*, was *the revelation of the God of grace in the Gospel*, i.e., in the incarnate and crucified and risen Christ. The same experience which Paul had undergone in his day was passed through by Luther . . . and he learned by this experience, *that it is God who gives faith*: 'When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me.' . . .

Behind the words of Luther there shines brightly, steadily, and unmistakably the greatest fact in the world — the divine action in Jesus Christ and the experience of faith in this action. . . .

Let Luther speak for himself: "It is a living, busy, active, powerful thing, faith: it is impossible for it not to do good continually. It never asks whether good works are to be done: It has done them before there is time to ask the question, and it is always doing them." . . .

The whole Church may well thank God for Martin Luther, who found again and blazoned abroad the richest inheritance which belongs to the Body of Christ.

Submitted by WM. DALLMANN

### The Future of Lutheranism in Russia

Writing in the *Lutheran* of Sept. 18 on the subject "Will Lutheranism Revive in Russia?" Albert Grunwald submits important information and views which our readers should see; hence we reprint the article. —

Soon after the Reformation, Lutherans from western Europe began to migrate to Russia. Artisans, architects, physicians, etc., from Germany were invited by the Czars. They came to Moscow and other large centers. Already during the reign of Ivan the Terrible (1547—84) German Lutheran colonists and prisoners of war from the Baltic provinces settled in the region of the Volga.

In 1576 the first Lutheran Church was erected in a suburb of Moscow. But due to the fanatical opposition of the Russian Orthodox clergy and the *boyars* to Protestantism, this church was destroyed by a mob in 1578. It was rebuilt and again destroyed in 1610; similarly it was rebuilt and burnt in 1632 and 1649. In 1662, Czar Alexei refused permission for the erection of a new church and threatened to exile to Siberia all who would take part in Lutheran worship.

Oppression of Lutheranism ended when Peter the Great became Czar (1682—1725). He was determined to eliminate the political power of the Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church. While studying in western Europe, he had carefully observed the close and friendly co-operation between the Lutheran Church and the various secular governments. With this in mind, he encouraged systematically the immigration of Lutherans to his empire. In the course of time the new capital city, St. Petersburg, became the center of Lutheranism in Russia. Soon St. Peter's Congregation was established, to be followed later by St. Ann's. The strong appeal of Patriarch Joachim to keep out of Holy Russia all accursed Protestants merely strengthened the determination of the Czar to get rid of the Patriarchate.

The greatest impetus to Lutheran immigration, however, came from Catherine the Great (1762—96). Between 1764 and 1776 she induced 23,184 German immigrants (mostly Lutheran) to settle

104 colonies in the Volga region. In 1765 and 1768, 110 families from Brandenburg and Wuerttemberg, and 67 from the Palatinate, were settled in the province of Petersburg. Again, in 1787, she called German Lutheran settlers to southern Russia.

This immigration policy was continued by Alexander I (1801 to 1825). On Feb. 20, 1804, he guaranteed to the new colonists numerous privileges: 60—160 acres of land, tax exemption, freedom from military service, religious liberty. From 1804 to 1809 approximately 50,000 Lutheran settlers established 207 colonies in the provinces of Ekaterinoslav, Cherson, Crimea, Bessarabia, Charkov, and the Don region. 1816—17 a group of about 9,000 Lutheran immigrants settled in the Caucasus. Before and during the reign of Alexander II (1855—81), especially in consequence of the Polish revolutions in 1830—31 and 1862—64, large numbers of Lutheran refugees and immigrants arrived from Poland (and, to a limited degree, from eastern Germany) and settled in the provinces of Volynia, Podolia, and Kiev.

The two oldest groups of Lutherans, dating back to the Reformation period, were in the Baltic provinces (Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia), Lithuania, and in Russian Poland.

The Lutheran Church was formally organized in 1832, when the state recognized the Lutherans as a "privileged church," and in an elaborate code of ecclesiastical laws defined the relations between church and government, and regulated the administration of the church. Several consistories were established for the various areas of the empire. The Baltic Lutherans received three consistories: Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia; the three additional consistories of Riga, Reval, and Oesel were later eliminated. Lithuania was under the jurisdiction of Courland. The consistory of the Polish group was in Warsaw.

The rest of Russia was divided by a line running approximately from the Gulf of Finland to the Sea of Azov. The territory west of this line was administered by the consistory of St. Petersburg, and the eastern territories, including the Caucasus and Asiatic Russia, were under the jurisdiction of the consistory of Moscow. All consistories were under the control of the "General Consistory" in St. Petersburg. The General Consistory was responsible to the "Department for the Affairs of Foreign Confessions" in the Ministry of the Interior.

Before the First World War there were approximately four million Lutherans in Russia (Finland not included). The imperial census of 1897 counted 3,762,756 Lutherans. But the census was certainly not accurate. A good many unchurched Lutherans, scattered over the vast empire, were unknown to the statistical office of the General Consistory and were not reached by the census.

Shortly before 1914, the Church reported 641,000 baptized members in the district of the St. Petersburg consistory, with 126 parishes (*Kirchspiel*, i. e., large parish); 459,000 in the Moscow consistory, with 80 parishes; 2,200,000 in the Baltic consistories; about

400,000 (4.5 per cent of the population) in Russian Poland. But these statistics, too, were incomplete, since they were based on the parochial reports, which under the prevailing circumstances were never perfectly accurate.

The Lutheran Church had strong parishes in most large cities (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, Charkov, Shitomir, Saratov, Warsaw, Lodz, but also in rural areas large and beautiful churches were very frequent. In St. Petersburg (Leningrad) the Lutherans had three hospitals; several homes for the aged, poor, and insane; orphanages; young people's centers; four colleges (*Gymnasium* and *Realschule*); two girls' schools; four elementary schools. Scattered over the empire, from Moscow to the Caucasus, were numerous schools, institutions for Inner Mission work, etc.

Since 1831 the Church had its own Bible Society. In 1858 the *Unterstützungskasse fuer Evang.-Lutherische Gemeinden* was established for the support of needy pastors, teachers, congregations, and institutions. In 1903 it had an endowment fund of 926,533 rubles, and the expenditures of that year were 118,294.02 rubles.

The Church developed very favorably up to the time of Alexander III (1881-94). In 1885 the Czar inaugurated his program of Russification of the Lutheran Church. The reasons for this systematic repression are manifold; they were political, military, economic, hierarchical.

Russia's former friendly relations with Germany became strained on account of the rapidly deteriorating situation involving Austria and Russia. The German-Austrian Alliance, effected by Bismarck, was the beginning of the end of the traditional friendship between the Russians and the Germans. The Pan-Slavic propaganda against Germany and the Germans in Russia became increasingly hostile.

The Russian aristocracy had long resented the great influence of prominent Germans at the court of St. Petersburg. An anti-German reaction was soon very strongly felt from this direction.

Russian military leaders began to worry about the potential adverse strength of the German element in Russia in case of a war with Germany. The Baltic provinces, Poland, and the Ukraine were honeycombed with German colonies, which could become a menace for Russian military operations. Therefore immediate restrictions were imposed—concerning erection of church spires, possession of arms, etc.

The agricultural authorities looked with apprehension on some 13,975,000 *desyatins* of the best soil of Russia which were in German hands (Baltic—4,500,000; Polish-Volynia group—1,000,000; Volga—2,000,000; Caucasus—75,000; southern Ukraine—5,000,000). On the other hand there were many millions of Russian peasants who had very little or no land at all. This fact especially embittered the peasants, who began to hate the German "foreigners" as much as their big landowners, who controlled the bulk

of the Russian soil. Furthermore, the German farmers were usually very prosperous, whereas the Russian peasants were mostly poor. Widespread envy resulted from this situation.

The Pan-Slavic ideology further took exception to the German character of the Lutheran Church. Although clergy and people were entirely loyal to the state, they retained the language of their ancestors and the inherited western European cultural characteristics; and thus they appeared to the extreme Russian nationalists as objectionable.

The Russians did not realize that no nation can hope to absorb easily a racial group of superior cultural standing. As a matter of fact, Russia had been unable to assimilate any of her many nationalities. Suspensions increased in the beginning of the twentieth century when Germany inaugurated carefully planned return-migration (*Rueckwanderung*) of German colonists, especially from Poland and the western Ukraine. Several Lutheran pastors and *Kuesterlehrer*, without disloyal intentions, became involved in this movement and attracted the attention of the Russian secret police.

Growing antagonism toward the Lutherans was especially aggravated by the Orthodox hierarchy and clergy. They not only hated Protestant "heretics," but envied the high educational and social standard of the Lutheran pastors. Since "the majority of the Orthodox clergy received no salary either from the state or the church, their income seldom surpassed a sum equivalent to fifty pounds a year. This meant that by their social status they were nearer to the peasant community than to the professional classes. . . . The chief defect of the clergy was their lack of authority; they were looked down upon by the intelligentsia, and not much respected by the peasants."

The status of the Lutheran pastors compared very favorably with the social standing of the Orthodox bishops. Furthermore, the Orthodox hierarchy was afraid of the general superiority of the Lutheran Church and its potential influence on the Russian intelligentsia.

On the other hand, there were factors which caused an inner weakness in the Lutheran Church of Russia. First, there was a chronic and distressing shortage of pastors. The Church had only one theological school, the theological faculty of the University of Dorpat [Jurjew]. As a rule all students had to be Russian subjects, born in Russia, and graduates of a *Gymnasium*. Graduates who aspired to become theologians were scarce in the German colonies; most of them, but not enough, came from the Baltic provinces.

Consequently the parishes were very large, in most cases far too large. The *Kirchspiel* frequently consisted — especially in southwestern and eastern Russia — of 20 to 30 small congregations. Even in the old Baltic provinces, parishes with 7,000 to 10,000 baptized members were no exception. In eastern and southwestern



Russia, pastors often were able to visit the various congregations of the parish only several times during the year. In their absence *Kuesterlehrer* (a typical *clerus minor* of the old Lutheran Church in Germany) were in full charge of the congregation. Pastoral functions they were not allowed to perform were: confirmation, Holy Communion, and matrimony. They were usually, by no means always, trained in special seminaries (Reval, Heimthal, etc.). But since their spiritual authority and influence were extremely limited, they were inadequate vicars of the pastors. Thus frequently the parishioners knew very little or nothing about the vital doctrines of their Church.

This situation produced extremely grave weakness. Various sects (Herrnhut Brethren, Stundists, Baptists, Seventh-Day Adventists, etc.) took advantage of it and proselytized among Lutherans with fanatical zeal. Baptists were particularly successful; since the establishment of religious freedom in Russia (1905) they had induced hundreds of thousands of Lutherans to leave the church of their fathers. The Baptists, by the way, drew numerous converts from the Orthodox Church.

This is, in brief outline, the status of the Lutheran Church in Russia before the war of 1914—1918. During the first three years of the war the Church suffered severely. In the name of military necessity the Czarist government uprooted the Lutheran communities and colonies of the Polish and Ukrainian areas, exiling them to Siberia or the Volga region. During this mass transportation more than 100,000 Lutherans died of privation and epidemic diseases. Their pastors, although not imprisoned, were subjected to material suffering and severe humiliations; a good many did not survive this ordeal. When the Red revolution broke out and the Czarist government collapsed in 1917, the Lutheran Church hoped that a new era of freedom and tolerance would commence.

Instead, a Bolshevik fury of violent intensity was unleashed against all churches. Rapidly Christianity was paralyzed in Russia. Scores of Lutheran pastors, together with thousands of Orthodox priests, were executed in a few months. Within a year more than half of them had been martyred; others had escaped to Germany. The administrative functions of the consistories ceased. Poland and the Baltic provinces were separated from the Russian state. No new pastors could be trained. Utter chaos had overcome the Church. Lutheran Bishop Freifeldt died in 1923. Finally, in June, 1924, the Bolsheviks granted the remaining pastors permission to convene a General Lutheran Synod in Warsaw.

At this Synod two bishops were elected: Theophilus Meyer (primate, supreme spiritual representative of the Lutheran Church in Russia) and C. Arthur Malmgren (official representative of the Church abroad, supervisor of the theological training of the ministry). A new constitution was adopted, conforming to the radically changed political status. In the following year, 1925, Bishop



Malmgren established the Leningrad Theological Seminary (with eight professors and 30 students).

When Bishop Meyer died, on April 28, 1934, Bishop Malmgren succeeded the deceased primate as head of the Lutheran *Oberkirchenrat* in Russia. Up to that time (1934) the Leningrad Seminary had graduated in nine years 53 candidates who were ordained to the ministry. But only 25 had remained during that period in the service of the Church; some had been martyred, others were exiled, imprisoned, or had fled the country. From the pastors who were in service before the revolution in 1917, there were only 14 survivors in 1934.

However, the mortal crisis for the Lutheran Church began when, in 1933, Hitler's regime in Germany commenced a violent anti-Bolshevist campaign. The Kremlin's reaction was swift and brutal, and the position of the Lutheran Church soon became intolerable. Bishop Malmgren's episcopal functions were terminated. The Leningrad Seminary was closed. The few remaining pastors were martyred or with their people sent into the northern lumber camps or Siberian mines, where they inevitably perished. The outbreak of the German-Russian war simply meant the death knell for the visible Lutheran Church in Russia.

According to the best available information there is not one Lutheran pastor in active service in Russia today. The organized Church has ceased to exist. It may be assumed that many of the exiled and scattered Lutherans, being without pastors for years, have been absorbed by the Baptists. The poorly educated Baptist lay preachers never attracted the attention of the Bolsheviks to such an extent as the far more prominent Lutheran pastors; consequently a good many of them escaped the Red extermination campaign. Already after the collapse of the empire, when numerous Lutheran parishes were vacant, Lutherans readily availed themselves of the services of Baptist preachers. Thus probably a large percentage of the recently reported four million (?) Russian Baptists (*The Lutheran*, June 26, 1946, p. 7) is of Lutheran origin.

The Kremlin, even during the war, took a more lenient attitude toward the Baptists, probably because many of them were of Russian stock. Thus, the historic Lutheran church in Moscow was turned over during the last war to the Baptists, while the Lutheran congregation was scattered in Siberian exile. The new "All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists," of which we hear now, is obviously a predominantly Baptist organization. To what extent Lutherans are participating in this organization, if at all, is not yet clear.

What are the prospects for the restoration of the Lutheran Church in Russia? In the first place, it is doubtful whether many Lutherans have survived the recent extermination ordeal. Then, what is left of the young generation is certainly very greatly influenced by the most efficient atheistic education and propaganda

of the Reds. It is at the moment futile to attempt to predict a possible change in the Kremlin's policy. The altered attitude of the Stalin government towards the Orthodox Church is no indication of a similar relaxation toward our Church.

The Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church is a very desirable political expedient for the Kremlin. Stalin needs the good offices of the Patriarch urgently for a stronger consolidation and integration of the nation; he uses the Patriarch in his determined campaign against the power of the Vatican. Moscow's influence in the Orthodox-Slavic Balkan countries is greatly facilitated by the Patriarch; the Patriarch's good relations with the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria (perhaps even Constantinople) are a diplomatic bridge for Russia's aggressive political aspirations and advances in the Near East.

The Kremlin cannot expect any political advantages from the Lutheran Church. Furthermore, the recent violent persecution of the Baltic Lutheran clergy, after the withdrawal of the German armies, is the latest manifestation of the deep-rooted antagonism of the Bolsheviks against the cultured, well-educated Lutheran pastor—as contrasted with the submissive docility of the thoroughly intimidated Orthodox batyushka (priest).

However, the unchallenged power and political structure of the Soviet government is now so well established that a reorganization of a small Lutheran Church could in no way affect the ideology and safety of the state or the interests of the Orthodox Church. Since Moscow in recent years has relaxed its policy of severe suppression toward other non-Orthodox religious groups, it is not impossible that the Kremlin may eventually grant the scattered remnants of the martyred Lutheran Church some humble privileges. Much will depend on the development of political relations between Russia and Germany in the near future.

## A Further Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education

By EMIL F. PETERSON

Director of Christian Education of Immanuel Ev. Luth. Church, Mankato, Minn.

This is the second in a series of studies being made by a group of pastors doing seminar work in the field of education under the direction of Prof. Ove S. Olson, Ph. D., head of the department of education at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minn.

The first in this series of studies was an evaluation made by former pupils on the basis of a questionnaire mailed to graduates of a Lutheran school.\* That study was a subjective evaluation; therefore it was limited in its significance. The purpose here is to present an objective study which was made on the basis of pupils' achievement in the academic subjects. In this study there

---

\* CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, XVII, 704.

Table Number I. Statistical Results of All Scores for All Subjects

Year Subject	Perfect Score	Passing Score	Range			Quartile 1			Median			Quartile 3			
			S	C	L	S	C	L	S	C	L	S	C	L	
<b>1935</b>															
Geography	132	72	4.5-124.5	24.5-124.5	56-106	71.6	71.2	68.5	86	83.8	83.5	98.6	98.4	93.5	
English	159	104	24.5-154.5	64.5-154.5	75-140	103.7	110.9	91.5	119	122.7	104	131.6	132.4	115.5	
General Math.	123	59	4.5-124.5	24.5-114.5	41-103	58.5	71.5	59.2	76	85.5	67	90.9	93.6	80.7	
General Science	131	79	4.5-124.5	44.5-124.5	63-99	78.2	84.6	73.2	94	97.7	85	105.7	98.5	88.7	
Social Studies	137	63	15.5-134.5	24.5-124.5	55-111	62.8	65.4	60.2	80	88.5	77	95.4	93.5	84.7	
<b>1940</b>															
Geography	130	70	14.5-134.5	34.5-114.5	56-114	77.6	71.8	62.2	85.3	85.4	81	104.7	95.8	103.7	
English	150	81	14.5-144.5	54.5-134.5	65-136	88.2	85.6	67.2	108.2	102.2	98	116.9	114.5	104.7	
General Math.	99	46	4.5-114.5	14.5-94.5	31-87	54.2	57.2	36.2	68.8	67.3	45	80.8	74	62.7	
General Science	125	61	14.5-134.5	34.5-104.5	45-84	66.3	62.9	46.2	76.9	72	58	98.9	80.9	63.7	
Social Studies	148	78	14.5-144.5	44.5-144.5	57-119	86.3	78	66.2	102.1	100.6	92	115.2	107.9	104.7	
<b>1942</b>															
Geography	117	48	4.5-114.5	24.5-94.5	68-117	50.3	45.8	68.5	62.8	54.8	82	74.7	65.3	108	
English	155	92	14.5-154.5	54.5-134.5	93-148	99.3	96	93.5	113.9	111.9	127	127.1	121.4	141.5	
General Math.	100	58	4.5-104.5	44.5-94.5	65-98	64.7	64.8	65.5	78.5	77	79	88.6	88	96.5	
General Science	130	68	24.5-124.5	44.5-114.5	65-108	71.7	66.9	65.5	82.6	81.2	77.5	93.4	97.3	83.5	
Social Studies	133	55	4.5-134.5	34.5-114.5	58-105	60	53.6	58.5	74.1	63.1	78.5	88.5	93.6	89.5	
<b>1944</b>															
Geography	129	43	14.5-124.5	14.5-94.5	21-62	50.2	40.6	21.5	63.1	60.2	26	76.7	68.8	51	
English	137	83	14.5-134.5	74.5-124.5	78-114	94.4	88.4	78	101.9	98.5	85	111.5	108	85.5	
General Math.	118	61	4.5-124.5	24.5-114.5	39-85	70	62.6	39.5	84.7	77.3	68	96.8	92.2	68.5	
General Science	136	66	14.5-134.5	24.5-124.5	46-82	74	72.2	46.5	87.9	85.4	73	101.6	101.5	73.5	
Social Studies	141	66	4.5-134.5	34.5-134.5	62-107	75.4	76.9	62.5	93.5	95.4	74	107.5	106.8	74.5	
<b>1945</b>															
Geography	123	44	4.5-124.5	14.5-94.5	45-108	50.2	31	54.5	62.6	52.8	64.5	75.9	66.4	69.5	
English	135	83	24.5-134.5	54.5-124.5	76-126	91.2	86.9	93.5	102.5	101.6	103.5	113.4	110.7	110.5	
General Math.	132	53	4.5-124.5	14.5-114.5	50-117	61.5	47.7	74.5	76	67	78	88.2	78.2	85.5	
General Science	129	70	24.5-124.5	44.5-114.5	66-107	75.8	70.1	66.5	87.3	89	74.5	93.5	90.2	79.5	
Social Studies	125	67	24.5-124.5	34.5-124.5	67-116	70.7	67.4	71.5	87.3	82	84.5	98.6	93.3	99	

S - State  
C - County

S - State

C - County

L - Lutheran School

is no attempt to measure the religious values of such a Lutheran school education. It was decided to compare the achievement of students in the public schools of the State of Minnesota and of Blue Earth County, and the students in a Lutheran day school with respect to performance shown in State board examinations given in geography, English, mathematics, science, and social studies.

State board examinations are given every year in Minnesota in many public schools as well as in many Lutheran day schools. All of these tests are given in the eighth grade with the exception of geography, which is given in the seventh grade.

Statistics included in this study with reference to the State and county were furnished by the State Department of Education, and the authors of this study are especially indebted to Mr. T. J. Berning, assistant commissioner of education, and Mr. Roy H. Larson, assistant director of rural education in the State of Minnesota, for the source material relative to the achievement of pupils in the State of Minnesota and in Blue Earth County.

The Lutheran school chosen for this study was located in an urban community in Blue Earth County, Minn. This community has a population numbering upwards of 20,000. The school has eight grades, with one male teacher and three woman teachers. It has had an average enrollment of 130 pupils during most of the years included in this study. Many of the graduates who answered the questionnaires on the subjective evaluation of a Lutheran day school education are numbered in this present study.

It was originally planned to make a comparison between the achievement in State board examinations of the schools in the State of Minnesota and Blue Earth County, and a Lutheran day school for a period of ten years. However, the task seemed rather large and unnecessary to determine an over-all picture. Therefore this study has been limited to five years covering a ten-year period, namely, 1935, 1940, 1942, 1944, and 1945.

In Table Number I the statistical results of the scores for all the various subjects are recorded. From this table it is possible to make all sorts of comparisons, for here is recorded the perfect score and the passing score as established by the State Department of Education. Furthermore, in this chart the range for each subject and year is included, together with the median and the semi-interquartile range. It is upon the basis of this table that the following comparisons are made. Table Number II contains a record of the cases for the State, county, and the Lutheran school.

**Table Number II. Number of Cases**

Cases	S-35	C-35	L-35	S-40	C-40	L-40	S-42
Geography .....	14,910	277	13	5,311	116	13	13,407
English .....	14,155	294	13	5,093	121	13	13,250
Mathematics .....	14,050	267	13	5,026	121	13	13,473
Science .....	13,338	280	13	5,056	124	13	12,935
Social Studies .....	13,884	295	13	4,971	124	13	13,075

Cases	C-42	L-42	S-44	C-44	L-44	S-45	C-45	L-45
Geography .....	50	6	5,787	117	5	6,116	112	12
English .....	59	6	5,010	103	7	5,651	113	12
Mathematics .....	62	6	5,034	102	7	5,589	113	12
Science .....	57	6	5,023	101	7	5,652	118	12
Social Studies .....	44	6	5,032	103	7	5,579	114	12
S — State	C — County		L — Lutheran School					

### Comparison of Median Scores in All Subjects

If one were to average the medians recorded in Table Number I for the State, the county, and the Lutheran school, the results would be as indicated in Table Number III.

**Table Number III. Comparison of Median Scores in All Subjects**

Year	1935	1940	1942	1944	1945
State .....	91	88.3	88.2	86.2	83.1
County .....	95.4	85.5	77.6	83.4	78.5
Lutheran School .....	83.3	74.8	88.8	65.2	81

From this table it is evident that the State ranks highest in four years and the county in one year, while the Lutheran school is higher than the county and the State in one year. The Lutheran school is higher than the county in two years. With one exception, the lower scores for the Lutheran school are not so great. Especially is this true if it is borne in mind that the number of cases for the Lutheran school is very small. This would have a definite effect on the total picture. The results of five cases in the Lutheran school in geography was very low for 1944, and this likewise affects the total picture.

If the average of all the median scores in all the subjects for the five years is calculated, the results will be as follows: The State will show an average of 86.2, the county an average of 84.1, and the Lutheran school average is 78.6. Thus, the Lutheran school average over the whole period is only slightly less if the one or two low scores and the small number of cases are taken into consideration.

### Comparison of the Median Scores in Each Subject

The next step is a comparison of the median scores in each subject over the ten-year period. The results of this comparison are presented in Table Number IV.

**Table Number IV. Comparison of the Median Scores in Each Subject**

Geography					
Year	1935	1940	1942	1944	1945
State .....	86	85.3	62.8	63.1	62.6
County .....	83.8	85.8	54.8	60.2	52.8
Lutheran School .....	83.5	81	82	62	64.5
English					
State .....	119	108.2	113.9	101.9	102.5
County .....	122	102.2	111.9	98.5	101.6
Lutheran School .....	104	98	127	85	103.5



Mathematics					
State .....	76	68.8	78.5	84.8	76
County .....	85.5	67.3	77	77.3	67
Lutheran School .....	67	45	79	68	78
General Science					
State .....	94	76.9	82.6	87.9	87.3
County .....	97.7	72	81.1	85.4	89
Lutheran School .....	85	58	77.5	73	74.5
Social Studies					
State .....	80	102.1	74.1	93.5	87.3
County .....	88.5	100.6	63.1	95.4	82
Lutheran School .....	77	92	78.5	74	84.5

From this table it is evident that with one exception — and the cause of that exception has been noted repeatedly — the Lutheran school has done average work with the State and the county in geography. In one case the Lutheran school is well above both State and county, and in another case slightly higher than the county, and in two cases it is only slightly lower.

In English the Lutheran school is higher than the State and county in two cases, while in three cases it is lower. Similarly, in mathematics the Lutheran school is higher in two cases than the State and the county. In one case it is definitely below the State and the county, and in two cases it is slightly below.

A definite weakness of this Lutheran school is apparent in general science. Here it is found that the Lutheran school was lower in all five cases than the State and the county, and in some cases very definitely lower. In social studies the Lutheran school was higher than the State in two cases and higher than the county in two cases, while it is low in other cases. Table Number V shows this comparison of increase and decrease in cases and points for the Lutheran school over against the State and the county.

**Table Number V. Points and Cases of Increase or Decrease of Lutheran School over State and County**

State				County			
Increase Cases	Pts.	Decrease Cases	Pts.	Increase Cases	Pts.	Decrease Cases	Pts.
2	21.1	3	43.9	2	38.9	3	38.9
2	15	3	32.1	2	17	3	28.4
2	2.5	3	49.5	2	13	3	50.1
0	0	5	60.7	0	0	5	47.3
2	4.4	3	26.4	2	17.9	3	39.3
8	43	17	212.6	8	86.8	17	204

In Table Number VI a comparison is made of the median scores for each subject over the whole period.

**Table Number VI. Comparison of Median Scores over Whole Period**

Subject	Geography	English	Mathematics	Science	Soc. Studies
State .....	72	109.1	76.8	85.7	87.4
County .....	67.4	107.4	74.8	85.1	85.9
Lutheran School .....	67.4	103.5	67.4	73.6	81.2



From this table it is evident that the Lutheran school did equal work with the county in geography, and it was only slightly lower than the State. In all other subjects the Lutheran school was slightly lower than the State and the county, with the greatest difference in mathematics and science.

The over-all picture of the accomplishment of the pupils in this Lutheran school over this period of time in comparison with the pupils in the public schools of the State and the county is fair. There is a definite weakness in general science. Here there is room for improvement. In some cases this Lutheran school did not come up to the standards of the State and the county, but some factors must be taken into account. From Table Number II it will be seen immediately that the number of cases in the Lutheran school was very low in comparison with those of the State and the county. This would affect the scores of the Lutheran school to some extent. Furthermore, the fact that this study considered only one Lutheran school is another factor that must be taken into consideration. In some cases the Lutheran school has shown that it is possible to attain the academic level of the State and county, and in some cases it has shown a definitely higher academic standard than the State and the county.

Thus the results of one objective study in the academic standing of Lutheran day school pupils are presented. It is hoped that this study will do much toward establishing the standing of the Lutheran day school, for this study shows that many of the extreme statements with reference to the academic standing of Lutheran day school pupils are not based on objective investigation.

It is hoped that this study will serve as an incentive to others to make similar studies of the academic achievement of other Lutheran day school pupils.

There are many features which might be studied objectively and which would shed light on the quality of work which one might expect from the Lutheran day school. One might, for example, study the buildings and equipment, the preparation of the teachers, the curriculum and methods of teaching. The comparison of the results of such studies would reveal to some extent the quality of work which might be expected.

The over-all picture presented by this study should cause all concerned with the Lutheran school to put forth the very best efforts to bring the Lutheran school up to, and to surpass, the standard of the State and the county; for it can be done, as is shown by some cases in this study.

### How to Avoid Stereotyped Sermons

1. Use a text that has sufficient sermon material.
2. Let your theme not be just something of a general nature, a mere subject, but let it be specific to the text.
3. Vary the language and the presentation as the Bible itself does. Avoid trite phrases.
4. Begin your sermon with an introductory sentence that is striking and

compels attention. 5. Use illustrations. 6. Avoid outlines that simply present the material along the negative and the positive lines. At times this may be very effective, but it should not become the rule. 7. Let the text determine the number of parts in each sermon: two, three, or four. 8. Vary the length of the sermon, but never too short and never too long. — Paul writes: "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe" (Phil. 3:1). But while Paul again and again wrote and spoke the same truths, which we also must do, yet he did not always speak or write in the same way. Variety makes both for interest and a better understanding.

J. H. C. F.

### Acts 26:28

The words of King Agrippa addressed to Paul after the latter's grand testimony before Festus and his august visitors, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," have been debated a great deal. Mr. J. E. Harry of Columbia University discusses the brief remark in the July, 1946, issue of the *Anglican Theological Review*. He says the "almost" is an incorrect, untenable translation of the Greek ἐν ὀλίγῳ. He maintains that in the whole range of Greek literature there is not a single example of such a connotation. The rendering of the *Revised Standard Version*, "in a short time," he likewise rejects. He asserts that the Greeks conceived time as "quantity, not duration." That Paul does not understand the phrase as referring to time he concludes from what the Apostle says in reply. If he had thought that Agrippa referred to time, he would not have used the expression καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ, but he would have said καὶ ἐν πολλῷ. The latter would have been an expression he could have used with reference to time. Mr. Harry's own view is that we are here dealing with the mistake of a copyist who misdivided syllables. He thinks that the words of Agrippa contained the verb ἐπιθυμῶ. His free translation of the words of the king are: "You would make me a Christian in small (measure), *un peu, un poco, ein bischen*; in more archaic and poetic language: Thou wouldest feign make me a Christian somewhat." He holds that this is "something a great Caesarean would be more likely to say than to confess that he had been converted to Christianity in such short order, especially when he is speaking to one who has been brought before him with handcuffs on as a prisoner at the bar. The editors of the newest version of the New Testament appear to have sensed the need of some such verb as I have suggested, for they translate: 'You think to make.'" — It is not our intention here to argue this matter more fully. We should merely like to draw the attention of our New Testament scholars to the problems which are contained in the brief remark of King Agrippa.

A.



---

## Theological Observer

---

**Can a Preacher Throw Light on Inspiration?** — The *Lutheran Outlook* (November, 1946) continues its discussion of the question of Biblical inspiration with an article contributed by a Lutheran pastor (U. L. C. A.) who evidently means to unite the two wings in Lutheranism in America, one of which affirms verbal inspiration, while the other denies it. He "cannot make the manner of Inspiration a question of controversy," as he writes; for "in a sense, it is a *Verbal Inspiration* [italics in the original], as God's message has come to me in words." However, he goes on to say: "But I know that often words are weak instruments, earthen vessels, indeed." We regard this second statement as irrelevant to the question, for certainly, as used by God Himself, the divine words are not weak instruments, but very clear and powerful means of conveying God's thoughts to men. If that is denied, then the whole doctrine of the perspicuity of Scripture must be denied. Again, we have no right to deny the divine inspiration of the Bible on the ground that words in general are "earthen vessels." The doctrine of verbal inspiration is a Scripture doctrine and should be taught and confessed as all the other doctrines of God's sacred Book. In his conclusion the writer says: "The wise Lutheran preacher knows that it is necessary to agree not upon the theory of Inspiration, but on the purity of the Gospel message and the right administration of the Sacraments. That emphasis will help to bring the factions and fractions of the body of Christ together." We regard this attempt to heal the breach in Zion as futile. The suggestion really means that Lutherans should skip the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Bible and emphasize the purity of the Gospel message and the right administration of the Sacraments. But how can Lutheran theologians agree on the purity of the Gospel message and the administration of the Sacraments if the Bible is not divinely inspired? If the Bible is partly human and so fallible, then also the "Gospel message" may be partly human and fallible, and the doctrine of the Sacraments may be partly human and fallible, so that we must allow for a wide leeway in the whole range of Christian theology in general. No, indeed, the *sola Scriptura*, and that includes the teaching of divine inspiration, is as essential for sound doctrine as is the *sola gratia*. The latter cannot exist without the former. In a way, the undersigned is glad that the controversy was renewed in the *Lutheran Outlook*, for thus it has become manifest that after all there is not that full agreement in doctrine among the various Lutheran churches which has been claimed. J. T. M.

**The Need for Bible Institutes.** — Ernest Gordon under this heading editorially comments in the *Sunday School Times* (Nov. 30, 1946) on an article in the *Christian Century* in which the editor seems very much perturbed at the growth of Bible training schools.

Mr. Gordon quotes him as writing: "Among the Baptists and the Disciples they [the Bible Institutes] actually enroll more candidates for the ministry than all their educationally responsible seminaries combined, and the Presbyterians are threatened in the same way. Thousands of half-orphaned local churches have become victims of this invasion." But Mr. Gordon believes that there is reason why so many churches are turning away from the seminaries, securing for themselves as pastors graduates of Bible schools. One reason is the "mercenary spirit" present in some seminaries about which the *Presbyterian Tribune* (April, 1946) writes: "I have heard story after story of men fresh from the seminary, untested and unknown quantities, laughing at calls of \$2,100. What will be the eventual outcome in terms of small churches, of new fields? The questions answer themselves. . . . The faculty adviser of seniors in a large seminary privately confessed his dismay at the demands and attitudes of those he sought to advise. So the Presbyterian Church faces a critical condition in terms of its ministry." Continuing his account, Mr. Gordon relates how Colgate-Rochester in its Bulletin in May, 1943, has sought to attract students by pointing out to candidates that Colgate-Rochester graduates receive an annual income of \$2,818.00 while that of the Southern Baptist Convention amounts to only \$474.51, that of "all denominations," to \$672.29, and that of the Northern Baptist Convention, to \$1,037.75. But that is not all. Gordon says: "In his inaugural address as fourth president of Crozer, October 31, 1944, Dr. Edwin Aubrey gave this picture of life in a typical 'Modernist' seminary: 'Once in the seminary, the theological student should work intensively at his studies. When they are as heavily subsidized as our ministerial students are, we should be able to command their full time. Too many are working long hours on outside tasks that make no contribution to their training. Too many are actually making money out of a seminary course while they are beneficiaries of funds given to make their studies possible. Too many students are marrying before, or during, their seminary training not in order to share their preparation with their wives, but either to exploit their wives as homemakers and even as bread-winners, while they enjoy their intellectual development, or else to have the comforts denied to other professional trainees, while the school foots the bill. . . . A radical review of our scholarship program and of our students' outside work is called for. When a student can boast of clearing a thousand dollars in his seminary course, to quote an instance once reported to me, the administration may well examine its own trusteeship of its funds. . . .'" But there is a still more sinister note. In his address Dr. Aubrey said: "A seminary is itself a community, and in its life are built up the attitudes, good and bad, that shape a man's career. Much that passes for personal freedom in the academic community is simply irresponsibility. . . . More definite cultivation of the devotional life is desirable. Where is it harder to conduct

a service of worship than in a theological school? [Italics in the original.] Surely here, if anywhere, men and women should find it possible to live as a little Christian community." Students, however, not only neglect their studies, but are also given courses which do not help them become able ministers. Dr. Gordon quotes Professor Donovan of Andover Newton, writing in the *Crozer Quarterly* (July, 1943), as saying: "Courses undreamed of fifty years ago deal with philosophy in its bearings on religion, with various aspects of psychology, with social relations, with the study of other religions, with pedagogy, music, literature, drama, and pageantry," while they are not at all encouraged to an intensive study of the Bible for expository preaching and pastoral help. Former President Palmer of Chicago Seminary says that Greek and Hebrew may be studied, but are not required. "This makes room for studies in social and psychological fields which we consider as far more useful for the modern minister. We also emphasize courses in religious education, church administration, religious drama and literature, speech, music, missions, and even provide optional training in arts and crafts." There is much in Dr. Gordon's article that we must omit, but the reader may bear with us as we quote a few more of his statements. He says: "Our quotations from the official bulletins of these seminaries display the moral results that have followed this 'newer day,' which day is, after all, essentially the darkness of eighteenth century deism. One consequence of all this has been the extraordinary upsurging of the Bible institute movement. The institutes teach the Bible and believe the Bible and saturate their students with the Bible. They are winning away from apostate seminaries the interest and affection of thousands of churches. This is as true of the major ones, as the Moody Bible Institute, the National Bible Institute (New York), and Biola in Southern California, as of the little ones that are coming into existence constantly. Some indeed carry on mission work directly. The Prairie Bible Institute in Alberta has 700 registered students, besides 340 in its high school and 90 in its grammar school. Also an outgrowth [exists] in the West Indies, with little training schools in Cuba, San Domingo, Haiti, and Jamaica. In its Cuban churches are some 7,000 members; in the Haitian ones, 30,000. One is astonished that these many Bible schools can find support. Only the good hand of God upon them can explain it. The Providence Bible Institute in Rhode Island has 321 students and many buildings. A Far Eastern Bible institute and seminary has just been opened in Manila." Mr. Gordon then mentions other prominent Bible institutes and their large attendances in our country. He closes his article with the words: "This is God's answer, or at least some answer, to the theologians' scheme of bringing the Church's seminaries over to the outstanding postulates of near-Unitarianism. These schools may indeed have shortcomings, but they reverence the Bible and teach the Bible, and this fact carries with it the blessing of God for their



future."—What Mr. Gordon here writes is certainly deserving of careful consideration. The Bible institute may indeed be the solution of the problem confronting Christians in the liberal Reformed areas of our land; but they are not the solution which we Lutherans can accept. We demand for ourselves continuation of our orthodox seminaries with primary emphasis on the study of the Bible in the original and especially, on the Christian doctrine, based upon the Bible. But the ruinous trends of our errant theological world may also influence our seminaries and afflict us with the blight of Modernism, of a mercenary spirit, and, in general, of worldly attitudes. So constant watchfulness on the part of our whole Church is necessary and, more than this even, perpetual intercession and, where it becomes necessary, helpful criticism offered with brotherly love.

J. T. M.

**Recent German Publications.**—A number of internationally known German publishing houses are again in operation. Though it is still impossible to obtain German publications through the mails, our readers will be interested in knowing the type of theological material which is being disseminated among the German clergy. The Christian Kaiser Verlag in Munich has published the following in recent months:

*Evangelische Theologie*, a quarterly established in 1934 and suspended from 1938 to 1946, editor Prof. D. Ernst Wolf, contributing editors Profs. H. Iwand and W. Trillhaas. RM. 3.20. The editor has been professor at Goettingen for some time, while the contributing editors joined the faculty at Goettingen during the past summer. The first number contains three interesting articles: "Menschwerdung des Menschen," in which Professor Wolf sketches the antithesis between Christianity and Humanism; "*Sed originale per hominem unum*," by Professor Iwand, who shows the distinction between original and actual sin, using Luther's classic expression as his thesis: *actualia (peccata) enim omnia per diabolum intrans et intraverunt in mundum, sed originale (peccatum) per hominem unum*; "Wahrheit und Wissenschaft," by Karl Stoevesandt.

*Theologische Existenz Heute*. The first number in the new series of this well-known collection of theological studies brings an article by Goetz Harbsmeier, "Die Verantwortlichkeit der Kirche in der Gegenwart." RM. 1.20.

In addition to these two journals we list the following books:

Martin Niemoeller, *Zu verkündigen ein gnaediges Jahr des Herrn* (six sermons preached at Dachau Concentration Camp). RM. 1.30, 64 S. — Paul Schempp, *Geschichte und Predigt vom Sündenfall*, 144 S., RM. 3.60. — Gerhard Schmidt, *Katechetische Anleitung*, 118 S. — Gerhard Schmidt, *Handwerkliches zum kirchlichen Unterricht*, 4. Aufl., RM. 1.10. — Friedrich Loy, *Glaube und Leben, eine evangelische Ethik*. — Wolfgang Trillhaas, *Grundzuege der Religionspsychologie*, 168 S., RM. 4.00. — Edmund Schlinck, *Die Theologie der Lutherischen Bekenntnisse*, 2te Aufl., 432 S. The



second printing of this work was under way last summer, and it is assumed that it is now completed. This splendid text grew out of Dr. Schlinck's lectures on dogmatics while professor at Bethel-Bielefeld. The author, now at Heidelberg, is conservative and has taken an active part in the work of the Bekennende Kirche.

Among the many tracts and pamphlets on current problems in theology and ethics the following may be listed: Edmund Schlinck, *Die Gnade Gottes im Gericht*. Bertelsmann-Verlag, Gutersloh. Based on sermons preached at Bielefeld in 1945, while the author was professor at Bethel. Except for a slight departure in the doctrine of Church and State, the author sharply distinguishes between Law and Gospel. — W. Jannasch, *Hat die Kirche geschwiegen?* A discussion of the position of the Confessing Church toward the Third Reich. — Karl Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage*. A Heidelberg professor of philosophy discusses the question so uppermost in the minds of many theological and cultural leaders in Germany. — Herman Diem, *Restauration oder Neuanfang in der Evangelischen Kirche?* The author comes to grips with the organizational problems confronting the Church in the program of reconstruction. — Christian Stoll, *Jahrbuch des Lutherbundes* 1946. This is a collection of eighteen articles by such members of the Lutherbund as Sasse, ("Luthers Vermaechtnis an die Christenheit"); Preuss ("Martin Luther — Gipfel und Abgrund"); v. Boltenstern ("Gottes Barmherzigkeit in grossen Katastrophen"); Kuenneth ("Fragen und Gedanken um das Altarsakrament"); Heuer ("Die liturgische Bewegung in unserer Kirche"); Kressel ("Luther und die Liturgie"). It will be noted that the liturgy receives considerable attention. Not only among the Berneuchen school adherents in Northern Germany, but also in Bavaria and Wuerttemberg the liturgy is frequently discussed. There are several reasons for this, the chief factor being, that the Communion attendance in many provinces had reached an unbelievably low level. As a result the theologians have given much thought to the question of the Lord's Supper and to the liturgy in general. In fact, the term "liturgical movement" frequently denotes no more than the renewed interest in the Lord's Supper. (On Dec. 6 Christian Stoll and J. V. Bogner of the Bavarian Church lost their lives in an auto accident.)

Karl Barth, *Die Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland nach dem Zusammenbruch*. Like most of Barth's writings, this little brochure contains many fundamental truths. But the Reformed view becomes evident in several instances, particularly concerning the doctrine of Church and State. He states: "Die Erkenntnis der Gewalt Jesu Christi ueber alle Gewalten ruft nach dem Nachsatz, dass auch der Staat als oeffentliche Rechtsordnung zu seinem [Christi] und nicht zu einem anderen Reich gehoert. Und die Erkenntnis der unmittelbaren und totalen Zugehoerigkeit jedes einzelnen Menschen zu diesem Herrn [this reminds one very strongly of Calvin's common grace] ruft nach dem Nach-

satz, dass der rechte Staat jedenfalls auf der Linie zu suchen ist, die irgend einmal zur freien Verantwortlichkeit jedes einzelnen Buergers und also des ganzen Volkes und also zur Demokratie fuehren muss, und sicher nicht auf einer anderen Linie." (P. 27.) There is much praise for the members of the Confessing Church and severe denunciation of the German Christians. There is also a most unfortunate attack upon the bishops of Hannover, Bavaria, and Wuerttemberg. Barth condemns them as "middle-of-the-road" men, as standing between the Confessing Church and the German Christians, and thus proving themselves to be abettors of Naziism. He writes: "Es waren, merkwuerdig genug, hier (Marahens und Meiser) der lutherische, dort (Wurm) der reformierte Konfessionalismus, die sich in dieser 'Mitte' die Hand reichten. Und waren gleichzeitig die autoritaer-legitimistischen Instinkte und Tendenzen einer bischoeflich-konsistorialen Kirchlichkeit und politisch nun eben doch die Gesinnung der Deutsch-nationalen, die man hier zu einem Bremsklotz zusammenwachsen sah, der bestimmt das schwerste Hindernis gewesen ist, dass die protestantische Widerstandsbewegung [the Confessing Church] in der Hitlerzeit nicht zu voller Entfaltung kommen liess. Man sollte sich das gerade in der Schweiz und auch in den Kreisen der Oekumene wohl vor Augen halten: Wer heute nun ausgerechnet *diese* 'Kraefte' des deutschen Protestantismus hochschaezt und unterstuetzt, der lobt damit, was die Vergangenheit betrifft, diejenigen, die die ernstlich und entschieden Kaempfenden dauernd im Stich gelassen haben, ihnen dauernd in den Ruecken gefallen sind—und der foerdert, was die Zukunft betrifft, die Restauration, um nicht zu sagen die Reaktion in der deutschen Kirche, den Konfessionalismus, den bischoeflich-konsistorialen Bureaukratismus 'and last but not least' den deutschen Nationalismus, der, wenn irgendwo in der Kirche, dann eben in *diesen* 'Kraeften' seinen gefaehrlichen Rueckhalt haben wird." (P. 19.) Barth hates confessionalism. He considers the Barmen Theses, largely his work, a sufficient basis for church fellowship and the confessions of the Reformation as unnecessary and antiquated. His shibboleth is: "Wir muessen die Bekenntnisschriften aufrollen." Barth does not like the Lutheran episcopal form of church government and prefers the representative form as it is found in the Reformed provinces of Western Germany. We, too, have much fault to find with the form of church government in the Lutheran provinces, but the charges preferred by Barth against the Lutheran bishops are unwarranted and in our opinion emanate from his Reformed view, which advocates an aggressive policy toward a godless government. Lutheran theology takes a different position. It renders obedience also to evil governments as long as one is not compelled to do something contrary to the Word of God. The Lutheran bishops repeatedly protested against Hitler's interference in church affairs and were given house arrest by the Nazis.

F. E. MAYER

**The Problem of Germany's Youth.**—According to information sent by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, Germany's youth are eager to understand, and re-establish contact with, those of other countries from whom they have been cut off for many years. Having visited a number of German youth centers, the general secretary stated: "There is a disposition toward hopelessness throughout Germany, especially among the youth. This is based not only on material needs, but especially upon the fact that no one as yet sees a sign that there will be a newer, better time coming." The Germans, so he pointed out, are kept in a state of isolation and do not realize that there is need and distress in other countries, too. In Tuebingen he addressed a gathering of eleven hundred students, who were eager to know what the youth of other lands believe and hope. He has suggested to the military authorities in Germany to allow large numbers of students to study abroad. According to his statement, plans have been made to permit German students to attend the World Christian Youth Conference to be held in Oslo.

A.

**Church Work in Sweden.**—In an interesting article having the caption "What Does Sweden Expect of a Pastor?" Prof. Carl E. Rasmussen of Gettysburg, who recently visited in Europe, describes vividly the work that is done by Lutheran pastors in the State Church of Sweden. We quote a few paragraphs from his article which appeared in the *Lutheran* of December 11.

"The pastor has to give little time to winning new members. More than ninety-five per cent of the people in his parish are already members of his congregation. Confirmation classes take care of the additions to the membership. All but a few will in early adolescence enter the adult roll by that route. The pastor has very limited responsibility in the field of Christian education. The children are taught the Lutheran view of Christianity in the State's school system. The pastor will each year conduct his catechetical class, to prepare the children for confirmation. The pastor does not have to give any thought to the annual every-member canvass and its attendant pledges for church support. For the church is supported by taxes, which the church does not have to collect. The pastor may feel heavyhearted if the parishioners do not attend church; but the bills will not pile up if the people do not come. No church council will hint to the pastor that he had better preach more to the liking of the contributors, or lay a glad hand on their shoulders. The pastor has no responsibility for the keeping of the Communion roll. For there is no such roll at all. The only record kept merely reports the total number communing at each service. There are neither weekly envelopes nor quarterly statements. For in addition to the taxes for church expenses, benevolence contributions are spontaneously and unanimously dropped into the offering boxes or — on certain occasions — laid on the altar by the donors.

"Nobody remarks that it is a long time since the pastor has called on him; for the pastor is not expected to call. How could he, with parishes of thousands? One parish in Stockholm has 80,000 members! Many of the pastors in the large parishes preach less than one sermon per week. Being a large parish, it will likely have a staff of pastors. If a pastor nevertheless chooses to build into his program some of the unexpected activities—which are almost taken for granted in America—the fact is reported as news! . . ."

Continuing, Dr. Rasmussen points out that "one must not conclude that the life of a pastor in Sweden is an easy one. On the contrary, he says, the pastor has to work hard. Particularly in the cities, practically every church has a prescribed hour every weekday when one or more of the pastors will be available in his office. The church keeps all vital statistics for Sweden. That makes an astonishing amount of work for the pastor. Imagine what it does to the pastor's time just to conduct the funerals in parishes of such magnitude! Civil marriages are legal in Sweden, but nearly all choose to be married by the pastors. One is startled to think of the size of catechetical classes. He who has called on the sick in a congregation of 1,200 or 1,500 trembles a bit to think what it means to call on the sick in a Swedish parish. In Sweden, too, the pastor has his society and organization meetings. The great majority of the Church's benevolent works are carried on by voluntary societies. So the effectiveness of the work depends much on aggressive local promotion. And finally, there is a higher tradition of scholarship in the ministry in Sweden than in America. The very preparation of the ministerial candidate is illustrative. In the American church up to 50 per cent of the student's time may be given to the practical department. In Sweden the course for ministerial candidates takes seven or eight years after high school. Of this time only a half year is devoted to practical studies. The stress is on the scholarly. The result is a surprising output of all kinds of serious literature from pastoral pens. 'How do you find time for all your writing?' I asked a Stockholm pastor. 'By sleeping only five or six hours per night, and making up a bit with a short afternoon nap,' he replied."

A.

**How Can Our National and International Difficulties be Solved?**—On this subject the *Presbyterian* of December 19 prints a letter written by a gentleman in Pittsburgh, which should be carefully read and pondered. We reprint the greater part of it.

"In view of the present crisis featured by the United Nations negotiations now in progress in our midst and the critical coal strike, all Christians individually and through their respective churches should be praying and working for the Christian solution of these and like problems.

"There should be immediately inaugurated an all-out Christian revival throughout the nation and the world beginning at

Jerusalem (that is, at home). Such a revival should be instructive, inspirational, and practical. No new organization or machinery is needed but rather lighting the Christian spark under each Christian individually and under each existing Christian organization, with the purpose of having the Christians in each community individually and through their respective churches not only pray and preach but practice in home, business, and political life Christ's teachings and program.

"Obviously, Christians should tackle with confidence and persistence such current problems as the conflict between capital and labor and the demoralization caused by liquor and the crime wave which is prevailing at home and abroad. By united effort Christians can successfully cope with these baffling problems. At the start a nation-wide or, better, a world-wide revival should be undertaken but with the avowed purpose of following such revival effort with a continuing program."

It would seem practical for various communities throughout the nation to join in Sunday evening services which would be a combination of evangelism and practical application of Christianity to the existing personal and community problems. Such a united Christian program could include Christians of all churches, including the Catholics. Or such unity as could be secured at the start would be adequate especially if other Christian groups and churches would simultaneously conduct a similar program in their own way. Such a comprehensive and adequate effort would command the support of the secular press and many citizens who now are not affiliated with any church. Many of the latter, including millions of young people, have no confidence in the effectiveness of the Church's present activity and program.

"At the present moment, instead of trying to cure our labor troubles with court injunctions and our crime problems by having the Protestant ministers in Steubenville asking police powers and the United Nations being left to the godless environment of our great metropolis, we should be seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit in using the Christian ounce of preventive against the pound of punitive cure."

Let us all admit that the writer in the *Presbyterian* is on the right road. What he advocates in the line of unionistic vagaries we naturally do not endorse. But that there should be a resurgence of true, that is, Apostolic Christianity, the Christianity which in the dreadful days of persecution overcame the world, who can deny it? And that such a resurgence, if it were world-wide, would produce profound results, is there anybody disposed to doubt it? The old evil triple alliance, it is true, will not abdicate, but its sphere of influence can be greatly reduced.

The last days are upon us, nothing can be done, says somebody in the spirit of defeatism. That sentiment is only half right. Yes, the last days are upon us, and that is the very reason why the means of rescue at our disposal should be used with greater zeal and diligence than ever before. In the Lutheran



Church we do not like the word revival, undoubtedly on account of the excesses that have been perpetrated under that name. But if the term is meant to signify obedience to the call of repentance issued by the heavenly Master to the church at Laodicea (Rev. 3), we can have no quarrel with its meaning. The season of Lent, let us not overlook the fact, beckons us ministers to preach repentance to our congregations. A.

**The Methodist and Episcopalian Rapprochement.**—The religious press is giving a good deal of discussion to the suggestion that has been made in view of the failure of Presbyterians and Episcopalians to achieve union, that two Churches which are related as mother and daughter, the Protestant Episcopal and the Methodist Churches, should resolve their differences and form one body. A writer in the *Christian Century*, a former Methodist lay reader and now an Episcopalian rector, tries to analyze the difficulties and possibilities (see the issue of December 25). He is opposed to what some advocate—"a whirlwind courtship and a swift marriage." According to our authority, the schism between the two Churches has a deep social background: the Episcopalians, generally speaking, were inclined to side with Great Britain, and the Methodists with the Thirteen Colonies when the War of Independence was fought. Methodism got to be the religion of the frontiers, with their rough-and-tumble tactics; Episcopalianism remained reserved, staid, formally correct.

Furthermore, the opinions in the two bodies on Wesley differ, and this difference in evaluation is a mighty factor in keeping the bodies apart, says our author, more even than the problem "of orders, succession, and sacramental theory." Next, one must consider the difference in the conduct of services, Methodists believing in spontaneity, Episcopalians in following their Book of Common Prayer. The differences are, however, continually becoming less marked, each side taking over some features from the work and ideals of the other. Both churches have the Episcopal system, which, surprisingly, is more like that of the Roman Catholics with the Methodists than with the Episcopalians, the latter leaning somewhat more toward Congregationalism.

But there are other difficulties, difficulties caused not by interchurch relations, but by conditions within each one of the two denominations. A severe struggle is on in both, the controversy between Fundamentalism and Modernism. To the superficial observer it may seem that Episcopalians are seriously at odds among themselves on what is called churchmanship, the issue between the High Church and the Low Church parties. This is an erroneous view. There is a perturbing clash, but both opposing sides have their representatives in the High Church and the Low Church parties; it is the struggle between the Liberals and the Fundamentalists. The same thing is true of Methodism. "In every annual Conference there are liberal and fundamental blocs, clerical and lay." The author thinks that when the spirit which prompts



Modernists and Conservatives to live together as brethren in one and the same denomination begins to assert itself in the relations between the church bodies, "then there will be hope for union." The problem, says he, must be tackled at the grass roots; the work of commissions has often merely caused embarrassment. There have to be local discussions; let the theological leaders confer; let the opinions of the laity be ascertained; and by all means let there be prayer for unity. So ends the article in the *Christian Century*.

A few comments will have to suffice. The article is symptomatic of Reformed theology. A Lutheran divine would have written differently. He would have classified the differences as belonging either to a group of issues decided in the Scriptures or to a group on which the Scriptures are silent, and every Church has the right to follow what it considers most expedient and proper. The writer of the article lets matters of doctrine fade out of the picture. He, unconsciously, we trust, adopts the view of pragmatism: that course is to be chosen which will bring the desired results. He does not find it contrary to loyalty to the truth that people who adhere to the old standards of doctrine have fellowship with others who deny practically every one of the specifically Christian teachings. That is a stand which the Lutheran Church always has condemned and will continue to condemn. A.

**Brief Items.**—The Army chief of chaplains, Luther D. Miller, has issued a call for 600 former chaplains to re-enlist. Both in our own country and abroad the Army needs more chaplains.

In November, 1946, Kirsopp Lake, well-known N. T. scholar, departed this life. According to a report in the *Christian Century*, he of late had been living in South Pasadena, Calif. His specialty was the field of textual criticism; and he will always be remembered for the penetrating work he did with respect to the so-called Caesarean text of the Gospels. To him we owe the photostatic reproduction of Codex Sinaiticus, of which the Pritzlaff Library of our St. Louis Concordia Seminary is fortunate enough to own a copy.

**Brief Items from Religious News Service.**—There is an organization in our country called the Lord's Day Alliance. It recently, in New York, held its 58th annual meeting. Among its resolutions was one criticizing UN committees for holding sessions on Sundays.

In Canada a Presbyterian pastor, according to a Dec. 3 dispatch, complained that "non-denominational Bible missionaries are to some degree causing disintegration among the denominations and giving rise to numerous independent groups." There you have the result of Modernism, destructive higher criticism, and naturalistic philosophy. The common man does not care for learned speculations and doubts; he wants the Word of God.

At the meeting of the Federal Council of Churches held the early part of December in Seattle, Wash., it was announced that the Washington, D. C., office of the Federal Council would continue to function as an information bureau.

At Bloomfield, N. J., there is a school known as the Bloomfield College and Seminary belonging to the Presbyterian Church. In November and December more than forty active labor union members took a seven weeks' course there designed to help them counteract communistic influences in their organizations. Among the subjects treated were labor's right and responsibilities under the Wagner Act.

Presbyterians are endeavoring to organize their young people. The first national meeting of young people in the history of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (Northern Presbyterians) will be held in Grinnell, Iowa, June 30 to July 4. Each presbytery has been asked to send three delegates. The meeting will represent 500,000 young people between the ages of 12 and 23. From 10 to 15 foreign countries will send participants.

Methodists have announced their mission budget for 1947-1948. The total is \$9,381,319. Of this amount, foreign missions, carried on in forty countries, are to receive \$3,371,393. Home missions were allotted \$2,010,475, and for the women's division of Christian service the sum of \$3,999,451 was appropriated.

The Columbians are an anti-Jewish and anti-Negro group with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga. It is said to be responsible for a tense situation in the city mentioned.

The State of Wisconsin voted against public bus transportation for pupils of parochial schools. The majority against the measure was quite formidable; it had 107,658 votes more than the other side. In Milwaukee County the idea received approval with a majority of 2,012. Lutherans opposed free transportation, although they maintain parochial schools.

In spite of vigorous Protestant protests, Myron C. Taylor, the President's personal representative to the Vatican, has again left for Rome to assume his so-called "mission in behalf of peace."

In Shanghai there is a Christian school called St. John's University, which is one of the thirteen Christian colleges supported by American Protestants through the Associated Boards. For the first time in the history of the institution a Chinese has been chosen to be its president, Dr. Y. C. Tu.

Over seven million units of insulin donated by American Lutherans have been received by *Hilfswerk*, welfare agency of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKiD).

At Winona Lake, Ind., well known for its church meetings in summertime, the institutions that are devoted to commercial purposes will have to pay taxes. The properties were assessed for the first time this year after a group of taxpayers protested against the granting of exemptions.

Mrs. Harriet C. Stevens, the widow of a Baptist missionary, who with her husband worked in Burma, recently celebrated her 105th birthday. She was graduated from Bucknell University in 1858 and is the oldest living alumna of that school. She won fame as a translator of the Bible into Burmese and founder of a school for girls. Of her seven children five are living.

When the General Council (Sobor) of the Russian Orthodox Church in America recently met in Cleveland, it resolved to recognize Moscow leadership of the Church on condition that the American body be granted complete autonomy and may elect its own ruling head. More than 300 lay and clerical delegates from 275 Russian Orthodox parishes in this country formed the gathering.

Seventh-Day Adventists in all major countries will receive the denomination's paper *The Review and Herald* in their respective tongues, beginning with the first of the year. The languages in question are French, German, Dutch, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese, and Afrikaans. A condensed English version will be sent to Australia, Great Britain, South Africa, and the English-speaking West Indies.

In view of our mission venture in the Philippine Islands one reads with interest that four Presbyterian church officials, who arrived in this country after a three months' survey of religious conditions in the Philippines and Siam, speak of an urgent need of facilities for recruiting and training clergymen in the Philippine Islands.

In New York the question of a municipal lottery is being discussed. The Protestant Council of the City of New York very correctly called the proposed method of raising money a scheme which is "in reality one of the most cruel forms of taxation." It is pointed out that those who would participate would be individuals in the lowest income brackets. The people that would be exploited would be the underprivileged.

The Hearst Foundation, Inc., has turned over \$500,000 to four Catholic bishops of California for the restoration of the early Catholic missions in that State. These missions, founded by Spanish Franciscans between 1769 and 1777, extend from San Diego to San Francisco and consist of picturesque structures.

In Chicago, the Broadway Methodist Church has added a full-time psychologist and a new counseling clinic to its resources. It is announced that Paul Fruhling, a psychologist with psychiatric and psychotherapy training, will conduct the clinic, with the Rev. Robert E. Tinker, minister of the church, as his assistant.

Cardinal Griffin, archbishop of Westminster, states that his church will establish four centers in Great Britain where nuns and religious brothers will be trained in child-care methods. Rome does not fail to see the strategic importance of this kind of endeavor.

---

## Book Review

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

**Christian Denominations.** By Rev. Konrad Algermissen. Translated from the German and augmented by Rev. Joseph W. Grundner. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo. v and 1,051 pages, 6×9¼. \$7.50.

This is a study by a Roman Catholic theologian of his own Church, of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and of various Protestant denominations. Nearly one half of the volume is devoted to a historical account of the Roman Catholic Church, an explanation of its government and an exposition of its doctrines. The same aspects of the Orthodox Churches of the East are discussed, with particular emphasis on their liturgies. The Protestant denominations are considered in six sections: Lutheranism, Calvinism, Anglicanism, the Baptist groups, the revival groups, and the eschatological groups. The concluding part of the work furnishes the key to the author's aim and purpose: "The Reunion of Christendom." Upon discussing the history of reunion of the East with the West and the reunion between the Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism, and within Protestantism itself, the author shows what he considers the road to reunion. Guided by the principle *in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*, the Mother Church is to welcome her erring children back to her bosom.

The author's purpose explains his attitude. The Mother Church is presented in glorious dress; the errors of her wayward children are gently pointed out and rebuked. The author's efforts richly deserve the *nihil obstat* of the *censor librorum*. The book breathes a conciliatory spirit. By a judicious selection of Protestant testimony the author seeks to convey the impression of objective scholarship; by freely surrendering untenable positions he contrives to strengthen that impression. A friendly gesture is also made in the direction of modern science and religious liberalism. He readily declares the so-called Donation of Constantine a forgery. This has long ceased to be a startling admission; more impressive is the pronouncement that from Mary "would go forth the One who would crush the head of the serpent" (p.433). In a footnote (p.439) the author explains: "The Vulgate has *ipsa* ('she'); the original Hebrew text and likewise the Greek (*αὐτός*) have 'he.'" For the sections on non-Roman Catholic denominations a good selection of Protestant bibliographies is given in the footnotes. The discussion of the Reformation reveals a more profound understanding of Luther and of his work than one finds in many modern non-Roman Catholic writings and also varies agreeably from many earlier Roman Catholic presentations. Designed to call forth a sympathetic response on the part of religious liberals and of some scientists, but quite in harmony with Roman Catholic theology, is the statement regarding the creation of man: "Whether this formation of the human body took place by instantaneous creation or in the form of a slow evolution from inferior forms, which perhaps required hundreds of thousands of

years, the Bible does not say, nor has the Church passed any doctrinal decision concerning it" (p. 404). Regarding the Church's decisions, the Protestant reader may indeed, in the light of history, wonder at the amazing boldness with which the author maintains the charisma of infallibility attached to the Roman Catholic Church's teaching office in matters of faith and morals.

A few typographical errors and other lapses have unfortunately remained undetected. For example, Richard should be Reinhold Seeberg (p. 280); Julius II should be Julius III (p. 763); Henry IV should be Henry VI (p. 978). Errors like Chystraeus for Chytraeus are less important (p. 885). The publishers are to be commended for their choice of type and paper. Their claim that this work furnishes data that otherwise one might have to search for in a dozen different books may be accepted as a justifiable boast. And even if one should have Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* or an equivalent Protestant work, one would still find this scholarly work very useful.

L. W. SPRTZ

**The Quest for Holiness.** A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Investigation. By Adolf Koeberle, D. D. Translated from the Third German Edition by John C. Mattes, D. D. Second printing under copyright 1936, Harper & Brothers, assigned to Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis. xi and 274 pages, 8½ × 5¼. \$2.50.

This is the third time that Dr. Koeberle's book is announced and reviewed in this journal. The original edition, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung*, published in 1929, was reviewed in Volume I, p. 875. The English translation, prepared by Dr. J. C. Mattes, was announced and reviewed in Volume VIII, p. 74. We subscribe to everything that has been said in the two previous reviews concerning this splendid book on the relation of justification and sanctification. Dr. Koeberle is a conservative Lutheran theologian, though a professor in the Reformed university of Basel. We were informed that Dr. Koeberle accepted the call to Basel on the condition that he would not have to make any concessions to the Reformed theology, either in the classroom or in his church affiliation. The author discusses the heart of Christian doctrine: sin, grace, conversion, means of grace, sanctification. The German title, in our opinion, is more adequate than the English title. The author treats the following topics: Man's Attempts to Sanctify Himself in God's Sight, God's Judgment on Man's Self-Sanctification, Man's Justification Before God Through the Word of Forgiveness, Sanctification as the Work of God in the Life of the Justified Sinner, Sanctification as the Answer of the Justified Sinner, The Significance of Sanctification in the Preservation or Loss of the State of Faith, The Relation of Justification and Sanctification. The American reader must keep in mind that the book was originally written for a German theological audience. In the European theological schools dogmatics is frequently taught from the viewpoint of history of dogma. There is an advantage in this approach to the study of dogmatics, namely, the antitheses bring the correct doctrines into bold relief. There is, however, a disadvantage in this method, since the danger of veering into abstract philosophy and metaphysics is always at hand. While our author reveals his thorough familiarity with history of doc-



trine, he carefully avoids all metaphysical speculations. He draws his material from the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions. It is this approach which makes the entire book so rich in content. A careful study and re-study of the volume will pay rich dividends, both for the pastor's own spiritual life and for the enrichment of his sermons. In Dr. Engelder's words: "the Lutheran pastor will do well to study this book thoroughly, though discriminately." *Tolle et lege!*

F. E. MAYER

**The Papacy Evaluated.** By E. G. Behm. Publishing by Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. 171 pages, 5×7. Paper, \$1.25.

It is difficult to write a popular and yet absolutely fair treatise of the beliefs and practices of Catholicism. There are so many contradictions in Roman theology that a sweeping statement on almost any point of doctrine may immediately be challenged by a Roman apologist. We know, for example, that Rome has never revoked its rule that a special permit is required for the reading of the Bible. But we must be prepared for their counterchallenge that Benedict XV in 1920 urged the faithful daily to read the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. It is true, furthermore, that theory and practice in the Roman Church do not agree; in fact, that frequently the practice is worse than the theory. This is true particularly in regard to practice of saint worship, indulgences, the sacramentals. These considerations confront every author who attempts an evaluation of the Papacy. The author has presented the main tenets of Rome fairly and has succeeded in showing that the papal system is not only unchristian, but anti-Christian. The pamphlet is intended especially for the youth of our Church, the concluding chapter being devoted to Rome's doctrines concerning marriage and mixed marriage in particular.

F. E. MAYER

**The Lord's Supper in Protestantism.** By Elmer S. Freeman. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. 174 pages, 7½×5¼. \$1.75.

The author of this book is a minister in the Congregational Church, who presents the subject matter from the liberal Reformed viewpoint. One of the objectives of the book, as mentioned by the writer, is the drawing together of the various Protestant churches into closer fellowship through a deeper appreciation of the meaning of the Holy Supper. The records, as the author believes, do not show "completely and definitely" what "Jesus intended to do" when in the upper room He observed a "last sacred kiddush" (p. 19). But the last supper "fairly rapidly crystallized and solidified into the Lord's Supper, a religious ceremony or rite in the practice of the Christian Church" (p. 20). The writer believes that the "influence of the Mystery religions upon the Lord's Supper is considerably overestimated, except possibly in the case of Mithraism, where parallelism is most noticeable" (pp. X, 38 f.). Luther "reformed the Roman Mass largely by abbreviation" (p. X). While rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation, "his own doctrine, which he called consubstantiation, differed not materially, in a philosophical or metaphysical sense" (p. 59). "He transformed it [the Lord's Supper] into a self-oblation of the worshiper, mystically identified with Christ, who Himself offers the sacrifice" (p. 59). To contemporary Protestantism, for the greater part, the Lord's



Supper is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace . . . ordained by Christ Himself" (p. 77). It is thus "an act of thanksgiving, a recognition of fellowship, a self-sacrifice, and a sacred mystery" (p. 82). "Among churches without too rigid a doctrine of the ministry, the Lord's Supper is a bridge toward unity, while between these churches and others, holding uncompromising doctrines of the ministry, it is at present a barrier" (p. 96 ff.). These quotations set forth the author's opinions on various important matters and give the reader a fair idea of what the book has to offer. Of the fifteen chapters of the book the first eight treat the Lord's Supper from its historico-dogmatical side, while the last seven deal with practical questions arising in connection with its use. An excellent analysis of the contents of the chapters is given in the forepart of the book, which contains also an extensive bibliography and a helpful index. The chief value of the book lies in its demonstration of the viewpoint which a modern liberal with a Reformed background takes of the Lord's Supper. The suggested orders for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, either privately at home or in church assemblies, follow, upon the whole, traditional orthodox patterns current in denominations of the Reformed faith.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

**The Faith of Our Fathers on Eschatology.** By Ira D. Landis. Order from Ira D. Landis, R. 3, Lititz, Pa. 423 pages, 5½ x 8. \$2.25.

Mr. Landis is an orthodox Mennonite who is active as pastor, Bible teacher, and writer. Reared in the home of a Mennonite bishop, he early in his life was led to the study of theology. Later he enrolled in a Scofield Bible correspondence course and soon discovered that the whole Scofield dispensational scheme is at variance with the Christian faith regarding the second coming of Christ as this is set forth not only in the general creeds of the Church, but also in the specific Lutheran, Reformed, Mennonite, and other confessions. He has therefore devoted himself to the task of exposing the errors of dispensationalism and of vindicating the Christian truth concerning Christ's second advent as this has always been the official teaching of the historic Christian Church. The amillennialistic reader may not subscribe to every statement or argument in the book, but he will read with much pleasure and profit what the writer has to say on the problem confronting the student of Christ's second coming, the utter impossibility of bare literalism in interpreting the Old Testament, the origin of dispensationalism, Blackstone's *Jesus Is Coming*, the pernicious errors of the Scofield Reference Bible, and so forth. The author has read extensively in the field of eschatology, and the numerous footnotes prove that he is well acquainted with the vast literature that has been published for and against dispensationalism. There is so much that is valuable in this excellent new polemic against dispensationalism that we recommend it very warmly to our pastors and other church workers who are troubled with millennialism. We believe that the author is right when he says that "*kingdom and church* are used interchangeably [in the New Testament], except when referring to world and Satan's kingdoms" (p. 188). Very true also is this thesis: "The doctrine of 'Once saved, always saved,' one of the triplets of ultradispensationalism, has led Christians into a complaisance that is appalling" (p. 195).

A very interesting chapter in the book is the one on the "Postponement Theory," in which the writer exposes the many contradictions and follies of dispensational interpretation. In explaining Matthew 24, the author seems to apply vv. 3-35 too narrowly to the destruction of Jerusalem, whereas they include also the destruction of the world, the former being a symbol and foreshadowing of the latter. Certainly what the writer has to say on Matthew 24 is worth careful study, since it contains much important and illuminating information. In short, here is a scholarly and thorough study in eschatology, proving that dispensationalism is a sort of anti-Scriptural Modernism, which not only utterly confuses the Christian student of the Bible, but also endangers his faith.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

**Prince of the Pulpit.** A Pen Picture of Geo. W. Truett at Work. By Joe W. Burton. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 87 pages,  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . \$1.00.

The reading of this book will stimulate the preacher to a greater appreciation of his calling, to better preaching, and to greater zeal to win souls for Christ.

J. H. C. FRITZ

**Spurgeon's Lectures to His Students.** By David Otis Fuller, D.D. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 422 pages,  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . \$3.50.

There is much that we can learn from Spurgeon concerning the attitude of the preacher toward his work. Spurgeon also has many good suggestions, which a preacher might well heed in the preparation and delivery of his sermons. From these two viewpoints these lectures, delivered at his Pastors' College, make profitable reading. Spurgeon uses good English and has an interesting style. The book treats such subjects as: The Minister's Self-Watch; The Preacher's Private Prayer; Sermons—Their Matter; On the Voice; Attention! The Faculty of Impromptu Speech; To Workers with Slender Apparatus; The Necessity of Ministerial Progress; Open-Air Preaching, a Sketch of Its History and Remarks Thereon; Posture, Action, Gesture; Illustrations in Preaching.

J. H. C. FRITZ

**Broadly Speaking.** By Andreas Bard. The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa. 72 pages,  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . \$1.00.

This is a helpful little apologetic for judicious readers, pointing out by numerous illustrations in nine short chapters the reasonableness of the Christian faith and the unreasonableness of unbelief. The title of the book, while somewhat vague, is nevertheless attractive; it is a phrase much used throughout the book by the author. Short poems precede each chapter, serving as a sort of key to its subject matter. The reader may not subscribe to every statement the writer makes; yet on the whole the book is a fine plea for accepting the Triune God as the true Lord, the Bible as the divine Book of truth, Christ as the only Savior of sinners, and the Christian faith as the directive of man's life. It is packed with illuminating, convincing material which might well be placed into the hands of people troubled with doubt or infidelity. When the author writes: "We can never be satisfied with our faith until we find it reasonable" (p. III), he is treading dangerous ground,

though further exposition shows that he does not attempt to render the Gospel mysteries intelligible to human reason, but merely means to say that Christianity is eminently satisfactory, as demonstrated by the many statements and examples in the book.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

**Questions That Trouble Christians**, By W. A. Poovey. The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio. 187 pages, 8×5½. \$1.50.

The title of this book well describes its contents, for it treats the following questions: "Does God Answer Prayer?" "What Is the Unforgivable Sin?" "Why Do Christians Have to Suffer?" "Are Denominational Differences Important?" "What Is Predestination?" "Has Science Undermined the Bible?" "Why Doesn't God Destroy Sin?" "Is Church Membership Necessary?" "Can Only Christians Be Saved?" "Is There Such a Place as Hell?" These weighty questions the author treats exhaustively and with much theological acumen, and, on the whole, his replies are Scripturally sound. At times, however, there is mingled into the discussion a touch of levity which is irreconcilable with its seriousness. At times, too, the writer's verdicts may be questioned as, for example, when he says that neither Holy Rollerism nor Romanism, so far as their worship is concerned, should cause denominational differences. But the book contains also downright wrong statements. When, for instance, it speaks of two Lutheran bodies which had been divided for many years and which later came together to discuss their problems and found that they had been teaching the same thing, only the difference in wording having caused the foolish division, the author is mistaken if he (as the context suggests) refers to the regrettable split between Ohio and Missouri. Again, when he says: "We must learn to cut through the verbiage that has grown up around our articles of faith" (p. 71) and then illustrates his point by representing one party as calling a doctrine *rice*, while the other calls it *oryza sativa*, one using the common English and the other the Latin botanical name, the question may be raised whether or not real differences in doctrine are involved by such deliberate use of different terms. But the author is right when in his final verdict he says that "true unity can be achieved only on the basis of God's Word" (p. 79). Most of the questionable statements are found in the treatise on Predestination. Thus when the writer says that "Predestination is not a particularly important doctrine in Christian theology" (p. 82), or that "it can thus be seen that this doctrine has been the tail wagging the dog, because it never has deserved the attention it has received in the Church" (p. 83), the reader will ask whether the author has fully grasped the significance of the doctrine for the *certitudo salutis*, as presented in Article XI of the Formula of Concord. But absolutely wrong it is when the author, while rejecting the "in view of faith" as taking the emphasis away from the grace of God and placing it upon man (p. 94), nevertheless, writes: "In His wisdom God foresaw the result that would occur when each man would come in contact with the Gospel. He thus knew that Luther would not resist but would allow the Holy Spirit to work in his heart. He saw that Judas would accept for a time and then later harden his heart and turn away despite every effort of God to keep him in the truth. He saw that Cain would refuse even to consider the message of the Gospel. On this basis He was able to predestinate

all mankind" (p. 92 f.). What else could that be but the *electio intuitu fidei* based on man's merit of nonresistance? Again, the author explains the mystery involved in the *Cur alii, alii non?* as a psychological one and not as one existing because on this point we have no special revelation. He writes: "There is a mystery about all this, but the mystery does not lie so much with God as with man. It is hard to explain why one man will receive the grace and another in similar circumstances will reject it. That is the great, dark secret of the human heart" (p. 93). This is quite at variance with the simple explanation of the Formula of Concord "*Id nobis non est revelatum*" (Art. XI, 56). The reviewer regrets that these and other *naevi* make it impossible for him to recommend unconditionally this otherwise timely and helpful book, especially since we need a book of this kind just now to place into the hands of our laity.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From Moody Press, Chicago 10, Ill.:*

**The Year of the Tiger.** By John Bechtel. 218 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ . \$1.50.

**The Voice of Thanksgiving.** Compiled and edited by the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago. 393 songs.  $6 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ .

**All Out for God.** By Walter R. Alexander. 140 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ , \$1.50.

*From the Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, Pa.:*

**Power for Peace.** By O. Frederick Nolde. 138 pages,  $4\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ . \$1.00.

*From Christian Beacon Press, Collingswood, N. J.:*

**Author of Liberty.** By Carl McIntire.  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ , 233 pages. \$2.25.

*From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:*

**H. A. Ironside.** Official biography by E. Schuyler English, Litt. D.  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ , 276 pages, including index. \$2.50.

*From Consolidated Book Publishers, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:*

**The Words of Jesus.** Arranged by Gilbert James Brett, edited by Melbourne I. Feltman. Leather bound; gilt edge; illuminated section. The Sermon on the Mount and eight paintings in color, with an index of the words of Jesus as they apply to everyday-life problems. A beautiful gift book. 291 pages,  $5 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ . \$2.95.

*From Oxford University Press, New York, N. Y.:*

**A Small Child's Bible.** By Pelagie Doane. Seventy one-page Bible stories, each with a new full-page picture. 142 pages,  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ . \$3.00.

*From the Christian Education Press, St. Louis, Mo.:*

**Song of the Earth.** By Fred D. Wentzel. 112 pages,  $6 \times 9$ . \$2.00.

*From Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.:*

**Christmas Messages.** By George W. Truett. 87 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{8}$ . \$1.00.